THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA): Why don't you sit down?

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: It is against the ruling.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA) : Can I force you to stay back here? It is their right to stage a walkout. Please sit down. Now, we will take up the Short Duration Discussion. Shri Pranab Mukherjee.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

On grave situation arising in West Asia threatening world peace and security

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, thank you for giving me this opportunity to raise the Short Duration Discussion on the grave situation arising in West Asia threatening world peace and security. Sir, there are two sensitive areas in West Asia where the tension is escalated. One is, of course, the problem which is going on between Israel and Palestine. And the other area is Iraq where, just now, the inspectors appointed by the United Nations, as per the Security Council Resolution No.1441, are visiting. And, in that context, we would like to express our views as to what role India can play to defuse the tension and also to ensure that it does not further escalate and also lead to some sort of armed confrontation.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in the areas of foreign policy and international relations, over the years, we have developed a broad consensus, and irrespective of the political parties occupying the Treasury Benches, hardly there has been any major differences in our approach to the international problems, in our relations with various countries, in our immediate neighbourhood or outside and, especially, in our relationship with the Super Powers. In one way, the second half of the last century is unique, because in that second half of the last century, the world witnessed no world-wide conflicts, except some regional conflicts, in stark contrast to the first half of that century, where two world wars took place. In the second half, especially in the 80s, world has moved closer with the end of the cold

war. Therefore, the perceptions with which we used to function, have undergone radical changes over the years. Long before the dismantalling of the Berlin Wall, who could imagine that a day will come when all those littoral States around the Mediterranean, who dominated the world history by constantly engaging themselves in fratricidal wars will think in terms of common market, common currency, common security policy and common external relations. This is the level of the changes which have taken place. Collapse of the Berlin Wall came much later, but it has added to that process. In this context, when the situation was becoming really grim, especially in the last four years when no UN Inspectors could visit Iraq, after the adoption of the latest Resolution No.1441, a team of UN Inspectors, as per the newspaper reports, is already in Iraq. We do hope, it will complete its inspection and give its report. On the basis of that the international community, specially the Security Council, will respond appropriately. But, in the intervening period one thing has happened. I would like to draw the attention of the Foreign Minister to this . I would also like to have his assessment of the situation.

Sir, you are aware of the fact that on humanitarian ground, the UN Security Council used to allow Iraq to sell a part of their oil to buy essentials, especially food items, medicines and other things. Since the sanction was imposed in the early 90s and it was very rigorous, as it was issued under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, which is mandatory to everybody. Therefore, India and many other countries pleaded that on humanitarian grounds relief should be given to them. They depand mainly on the oil resources and they should be allowed to export a part of that resources to earn enough foreign exchange to maintain themselves. Up to now, subject to correction by the hon. Minister, if I am wrong, in 13 phases this concession has been given at the regular interval of six months. But, I read from the newspaper reports that on last Monday this extension and this facility has been given for nine days only. It will come to an end on 4th December. I do not know whether it is actually correct or not. Perhaps, it is linked with the 8th December, by which date Iraq is expected to comply with the Inspectors. But, so far as I understand, the Inspectors' team are expected to give their report by February. So, what is the rationality? I understand it was hardly debated in the Security Council and the Security Council passed it unanimously. What would be the implications and what would be the significance of it? That has to be assessed. I would like the hon. Minister of External Affairs to throw some light on this

issue. Now I come to the position, as stated by hon. Prime Minister very recently. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I welcome the Statement of the hon. Prime Minister, when he very categorically points out that it is for the people of a country to decide who should be their rulers; what type of Government they would like to have. Nobody, however justified the other country maybe, can intervene to decide what type of Government, what type of leadership a country would like to have. The very basic fundamental principle of the Charter of United Nations, however high and mighty one may be, however small and tiny, the other may be, all of them are treated equal so far as the comity of nations is concerned, so far the application of the Charter of United Nations is concerned. Of course, because of certain historic reasons certain big powers enjoy special powers, we have no differences with them. Therefore, when hon. Prime Minister points out that if any country wants to intervene in the affairs of another country that must be based on the mandate of the United Nations. I am happy, the world leaders try to put their pressures so that no unilateral action is taken by any power to decide the issue. To that extent, the Government of India's stand has been balanced, but, what I will suggest, this stand should be maintained and it should be articulated and continuously this position should be clarified. We have very excellent relationship with the United States of America. There is no doubt that with the changing world situation, this relationship has better significance. It is not that we did not have good relationship earlier. From day one, United States of America is one of the largest trading partners of India. Whether it was controlled regime or liberalised regime, the largest number of technical and financial collaborations we had with any individual country is with the United States of America. Even in case of our requirement, starting from the days of PL-480 when we had inadequacy of food, we received their support, mainly, with the backing of one great American citizenry, about whom there was some misunderstanding at some point of time in some part of this country, McNamara. During his last phase as the Governor of World Bank, I had the privilege of working with him. Through his strong support, we got the International Development Assistance, through which Indian agriculture got a tremendous momentum as a consequence of which we have become self-sufficient. Not only we have become self-sufficient in our foodgrains production, but we are going to be a net exporter of foodgrains. All these things are there. But, at the same time, it is equally true that this country has accepted an independent foreign policy. Whatever we feel correct, just, proper, we do not hesitate to espress so. Therefore, the role, which we can play, of course, within the

limitations, which we have, we should try to play. After all, one need not come to the conclusion that whatever is said by somebody in ruling establishment is the only voice of USA. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have a very interesting quotation from the inaugural Address of a very distinguished President of United States of America. These words were said on 20th January 1989. I quote:

> " America is never wholly herself unless she is engaged in high moral principle. We, as a people, have such a purpose today. It is to make kinder the face of this nation and gentler the face of the world."

Sir, this observation was made by no less a person than G.H. Bush, the senior Bush, the father of the present incumbent President, Mr. Bush. It was a part of his inaugural address. I simply request the U.S. policy-makers to keep these observations in view; and in the last part of that observation, he said:

> "Goodwill begets goodwill. Good faith can be a spiral that endlessly moves on."

And here, I feel that we should strike the right note there, as it has been stated, which has been articulated as India's stated position, and we should stick to that. We should strengthen that position and say, if the inspectors are fully satisfied that whatever is required, as per the Resolution of the Security Council, for the identification and dismantling of the weapons of mass destruction of all three categories, nuclear, biological and chemical, in that event, sanctions should be lifted, and it is expected that Iraq would comply with the requirements, as per the Resolution of the Security Council. I understand that when the Information Minister of Iraq called on the Prime Minister, and probably, the Foreign Minister also had some interaction with him-may or may not be, I am not quite sure-but surely, this message has been conveyed, and as per the newspaper reports, I find that the Iraqi Minister has assured the Government of India that they will comply with the requirements, as per the Resolution of the Security Council. But, what disturbs us when we hear from the Foreign Minister of Iraq is that the documentation may run into thousands of pages after identification of the locations and categorisations of weapons and there may be some omissions and lapses. I would like to know whether those omissions or lapses would

be used as a reason for launching an aggression as apprehended by Iraq's foreign Minister and there, my respectful submission would be, what senior most Bush told in his inaugural address, that is: "Goodwill begets goodwill, and it has a spiral movement," that should be the approach, and not an aggression. It is really a problem. Everybody recognises it, and nobody is worse hit than the Indians are. The cross-border terrorism poses on us, what may be called, some kind of unguided missile. In which direction it will go, what would be its lethal capacity, nobody knows, nor it has been identified. There is a well-recognised fact that certain groups, utterly irresponsible groups, are in possession of these types of lethal weapons, which can endanger the humanity at their whims and caprices. Therefore, the entire world community is to assert itself against this type of approach, and for that, I would like to refer to what the Prime Minister has said in this context. If I am correct, the Prime Minister has used the words "restraint would be the appropriate thing to do at this moment of crisis which may take a serious turn."

Now, coming to the other point, Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir, I would not like to take more time, because some of my colleagues would also make their contributions. We are really disturbed over the developments in the relationship between Israel and Palestine. As it is known, we have, all along, supported the cause of the creation of a State for the Palestine. We have welcomed, during the entire 90s, specially in the early 90s, all the initiatives taken, from the days of the Camp David, to the peace initiative taken by the Israel Prime Minister, Shimon Perez and Yasser Arafat in 1995, after which both of them received the Nobel Peace prize. Unfortunately, in the recent years, the situation has deteriorated - and deteriorated very fast - even to the extent that safety and security of President Yasser Arafat has been in danger. I understand, the Government of India has very correctly pointed out that we stand by the causes of the Palestinians - we have no enmity with Israel, we have established diplomatic relations with them, exchanges at high levels are taking place - and we do believe, both Israel and Palestine can live in peace; but what is required of us here is, not merely observing it as a mute spectator, but playing some proactive role, if the situation permits us, and nobody better than the Minister of External Affairs can tell what the situation is, and what role we can play.

I shall conclude by making another observation, made by another great American President, I think he was the second President, John

Adams. He was the first occupant of the present White House. He moved into the White House, which was under construction at that point of time, on 17th November, 1801. Dr. Manmohan Singh ji told me that he was in the habit of writing a letter to his wife everyday; it is a good habit. This part of the information was given to me by Dr. Manmohan Singh, but, from another book, from history, I got another information, that the next day, that is, on 18th November, 1801, he wrote to his wife who was abroad, and a part of that letter became so momentous, that after more than 130 years, when Franklin de Roosevelt became President of the United States of America, he picked up two sentences from that letter and carved them on the mantle of the main dining hall, the main banquet hall, of the White House. I will read out these two lines, which speak of the American idealism. And those words are, I quote, "I pray, heavens bestow the best blessings on this House and all that shall hereafter inhabit, may none, but honest and wise men, ever rule under this roof." It was a good prayer then. It is a good prayer still now. My most respectful submission would be, the inhabitants of that great House act wisely, act honestly. Thank you, Sir.

प्रो. रामबक्ष सिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मान्यवर उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह पश्चिम एशिया में जो स्थिति उत्पन्न हुई है, जिससे विश्व शांति को एक खतरा उत्पन्न हुआ है, उस संबंध में इस सभा के वरिष्ठ सदस्य माननीय प्रणब दा अपने विचार रख रहे थे, मैं उनकी बात को बहुत ही ध्यान से सुन रहा था और मैं उनकी बातों से सहमत हूँ । अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिप्रेक्ष्य में जो उन्होंने कहा है, वह भारत की नीति रही है । भारत की विदेश नीति में एक निरंतरता है और यह नीति जबसे हमारा देश स्वतंत्र हुआ है, भारत के प्रथम प्रधानमंत्री पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी के समय से जो मापदंड स्थापित किए गए थे, हमारा देश आज भी उन्हीं पर चल रहा है । शांतिपूर्ण सहअस्तित्व का सिद्धांत, विश्व के सारे देश शांतिपूर्ण सहअस्तित्व के साथ रहें, सभी राष्ट्रों की संप्रभुता बहाल रहे, सभी राष्ट्रों की अखंडता और एकता बहाल रहे, इस सिद्धांत पर भारत सदैव चलता रहा है और भारत ने सदैव इस सिद्धांत का सम्मान किया है ।

मान्यवर, पश्चिम एशिया में, जैसा कि प्रणब दा ने कहा कि दो स्थल हैं, दो स्थान हैं, जहां तनाव व्याप्त है - एक तो इजरायल और फिलिस्तीन के बीच में और दूसरा इराक में । फिलिस्तीन और इजरायल के बीच में बहुत दिनों से संघर्ष चल रहा है । फिलिस्तीन स्टेट का निर्माण हो, फिलिस्तीनी लोग सम्मान के साथ रह सकें, उनका भी अपना संविधान हो, उनका अपना देश हो, उसकी अपनी सीमाएं हों, इसके लिए भारत ने मान्यता दे दी है और भारत आज भी उस पर दृढ़ है । इजरायल के जो लोग हैं, वह भी सम्मान-पूर्वक रहें, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की जो स्थिति उन दोनों के बीच में पैदा हुई है, उसका हल आतंकवादी कार्यवाही के द्वारा नहीं हो सकता । मैं समझता हूँ कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र ही सबसे ज्यादा उचित मंच है और उस मंच पर इन दोनों राष्ट्रों के बीच में जो मतभेद हैं, वह शॉर्ट-आऊट होना चाहिएं । इराक का मसला भी बहुत पुराना है । इराक के मामले में कुछ राष्ट्रों का कहना है कि उनके पास जनसंहारक अस्त्र हैं, जो

मानवता के लिए खतरा हैं । वह जैविक अस्त्र हैं या रसायन अस्त्र हैं, उनका निरीक्षण होना चाहिए । उनका पहले भी निरीक्षण हुआ है, लेकिन कुछ राष्ट्र उससे सहमत नहीं हैं । पन्द्रह देशों की एक समिति, सुरक्षा समिति, जिसने सर्वसम्मत निर्णय लिया है और जिसमें अरब कंट्रीज का एक राष्ट्र सदस्य था, उन सबने मिलकर सर्वसम्मत निर्णय लिया है कि इराक में जो जनसंहारक अस्त्र अगर हैं तो उनका निरीक्षण किया जाए । यह अनुमान है कुछ राष्ट्रों का, आज कहा नहीं जा सकता कि यह बात सही है या गलत है, लेकिन पहले निरीक्षण हो चुका है और वहां इस तरह के अस्त्र नहीं पाए गए ।

मान्यवर, हमारी क्या नीति होनी चाहिए ? भारत की नीति बहुत स्पष्ट है । अभी 19 नवम्बर को हमारे देश के माननीय प्रधानमंत्री ने हमारे देश की भावना को ठीक से व्यक्त किया है कि प्रत्येक राष्ट्र को अपनी सरकार चुनने का अधिकार है और वहां की जनता की भावनाओं का सम्मान होना चाहि । किस राष्ट्र मे कौन सी सरकार होगी, कौन उसका मुखिया होगा, किसी अन्य राष्ट्र को यह तय करने का अधिकार नही है । इस विश्व का कोई भी राष्ट्र दारोगा की भूमिका नहीं निभा सकता । किसी राष्ट्र को, चाहे वह सम्पन्न हो या विपन्न, यह अधिकार नहीं है कि वह तय करे कि किस राष्ट्र मे किसकी सरकार होगी, कैसी सरकार होगी, किस पार्टी की सरकार होगी और कौन उसका मुखिया होगा । जो भी डिफरेंसिस हैं, जो भी समस्याएं हैं, जो भी मसाइल्स हैं इराक के संबंध में, भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा है कि उनका निस्तारण संयुक्त राष्ट्र के फोरम पर होना चाहिए, लेकिन अब वह प्रस्ताव पारित हो गया । इराक ने चाहे पहले उसका विरोध किया हो, लेकिन अंततः इराक ने भी अपनी सहमति दे दी है और निरीक्षण दल इराक पहुंच गया है । मेरा विश्वास है कि आने वाले दिनों मे ये समस्याएं हल हो जाएंगी ।

इधर अंतर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में परिवर्तन हुआ और पूरा विश्व दो ध्रुवीय से एक ध्रुवीय हो गया है, परिस्थितियां बदल गई हैं । भारत पहले भी किसी राष्ट्र का पिछलग्गू नहीं था, न अब है और न ही भारत ने किसी राष्ट्र को बाध्य किया कि यह उसका पिछलग्गू बने, भारत ने प्रत्येक राष्ट्र की सम्प्रभुत्ता का सम्मान किया है और वर्तमान परिप्रेक्ष्य में भारत की जो भूमिका हो सकती है, वह सीमित भूमिका हो सकती है और उस सीमित भूमिका के अंतर्गत भारत ने अपने विचार को बहुत ही स्पष्ट ढंग से रख दिया है । मेरा विश्वास है कि आने वाले दिनों में ये समस्याएं हल हो जाएंगी ।

मैं आदरणीय प्रणब दा की बातों से सहमत हूं, लेकिन मैं एक विनती करना चाहता हूं। अभी हमारे बहुत सम्मानित सदस्य इस विषय पर अपने विचार रखेंगे, मेरी प्रार्थना यह है कि अपने विचार रखते हुए उन्हें इस बात का अवश्य ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि हमारा सम्मान, हमारे देश का सम्मान और हमारी सरकार का सम्मान अंतर्राष्ट्रीय जगत मे बना रहे। हमारे आपस के डिफरेंसिस हो सकते हैं, हमारे आपसी विवाद हो सकते हैं, हमारे राजनीतिक मतभेद भी हो सकते हैं लेकिन जब किसी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समस्या पर हम लोग बहस करें और इस सदन में इस देश के बहुत ही प्रबुद्ध लोग उपस्थित हैं, मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करना चाहूंगा कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय विषय पर बोलते समय इस बात का ध्यान अवश्य रखा जाना चाहिए कि हमारे देश की जो मान्य परम्पराएं हैं, उनके अनुसार हम अपनी बात कहें ताकि इस देश को अंतर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में नीचा न देखना पड़े और कोई हमारे ऊपर, हमारे देश के ऊपर उंगली न उठा सके । आपको हमारी सरकार की

आलोचना करने के बहुत से अवसर प्राप्त हो सकते हैं, लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि चाहे यह सरकार हो, चाहे इसके पहले की सरकारें रही हों, जब से देश आजाद हुआ है, तब से लेकर आज तक हमारी विदेश नीति में एक निरंतरता है और उस निरंतरता से भारत की प्रतिष्ठा अंतर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में बढ़ी है और मेरा विश्वास है कि जो हमारी नीति है, इसी नीति के तहत एक दिन सारे विश्व को हमारे देश की नीति का अनुसरण करना पड़ेगा ।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, जो चिंता व्यक्त की है आदरणीय प्रणब दा ने तथा इस बारे में और भी हमारे साथी अपनी चिंता व्यक्त करने वाले हैं, मैं उनके साथ अपने को संबद्ध करता हूं । यह वास्तव में चिंता है, कठिनाई उत्पन्न हो सकती है, युद्ध के बादल मंडरा रहे हैं, युद्ध न हो शांतिपूर्ण समाधान हो जाए, ऐसी हमारी भी इच्छा है ।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं । आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया, इसके लिए बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया) : श्री एस0एम0 लालजन बाशा । आपके लिए 8 मिनट का समय है ।

श्री एस.एम. लालजन बाशा (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज वेस्ट एशियन कंट्रीज के जो हालात हैं, उन पर आज हम लोग यहां चर्चा कर रहे हैं और वेस्ट एशियन की तकरीबन 15-16 कंट्रीज़ में सिर्फ इस्राइल, फिलिस्तीन और उसके साथ-साथ इराक में हम लोग बहुत ही दर्दनाक वाकये सुनते हैं । महोदय, इज़राइल और फिलीस्तीन का जो मामला है, वह काफी गंभीर है और इराकी मामला जो है, वहां अमरीका का ऐमबार्गो रखकर 1990 से जो हालात देखने में आ रहे हैं, वे काफी खराब हैं । जितने भी वैस्ट-ऐशियन कंट्रीज़ हैं, उनके इंडिया के साथ बहुत अच्छे ताल्लुकात रहे हैं और इन कंट्रीज़ में भारत का एक बहुत अच्छा रोल भी रहा है । मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर आप हिस्टॉरिकल बैकग्राउंड देखेंगे तो पता चलेगा कि इंडिया ने बहुत अच्छा रोल अदा किया है । इराक से भी हम लोगों की दोस्ती रहती थी और ईराक ने भी हम लोगों की बहुत मदद की है ।

महोदय, आज शांति होना बहुत जरूरी है । इसलिए मेरा सुझाव यह है कि इंडिया को नैगोशियेशन करके वहां एक अच्छा माहौल बनाने का काम करना चाहिए । इससे हमारे देश को भी फायदा होगा । हमारे ऐक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर यहां बैठे हुए हैं, उन्हें फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री का भी अनुभव है । यह मैं इसलिए बोल रहा हूं क्योंकि लड़ाई की वजह से इंटरनेशनल मार्केट में जब ऑयल के प्राइसेज़ बढ़ते हैं तो उसकी वजह से हमारे देश पर बहुत प्रभाव पड़ता है क्योंकि हम 70 परसेंट ऑयल इंपोर्ट कर रहे हैं । यदि वहां अच्छा माहौल बन जाता है तो ऑयल के दाम अगर एक बैरल पर 4-5 डॉलर भी कम हो गए तो तकरीबन 20-25 करोड़ रुपए का फायदा इंडिया को हो सकता है । इससे खुसूसन हम लोगों को फाइनेंशियल क्राईसिस में मदद मिलेगी । माननीय मंत्री जी को फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री का भी अनुभव है और ये अभी ऐक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर हैं और इस सदन के सीनियरमोस्ट मेंबर भी हैं । इन सब बातों को देखते हुए हम लोगों को एक पार्लियामेंटरी डेलीगेशन इन देशों में भेजना चाहिए क्योंकि हम लोग वहां

नैगोशियेशन करके अच्छा माहौल बनाने में मदद कर सकते हैं । इंडिया अच्छी कोशिश कर रहा है, दुनिया में यह मैसेज जाना बहुत जरूरी है । यह मैसेज दुनिया में जाने से इंडिया का रोल बहुत अच्छा रहेगा ।

महोदय, वैस्ट-ऐशियन कंट्रीज़ में जो खराब हालात हैं, उन्हें सुधारने के लिए हमें दोनों हाऊसेज के सीनियर लीडर्स को वहां भेजना चाहिए जिससे वहां एक अच्छा माहौल बनाने में मदद मिलेगी । इससे एक अच्छा मैसेज पूरी दुनिया में जाएगा ।

महोदय, मेरा एक पर्सनल विज़िट हुआ था इराक का । जब मैं 1995 में लोकसभा का मेंबर था, उस समय मैं और लोकसभा के स्पीकर स्वर्गीय बालयोगी जी वहां एक डेलीगेशन लेकर गए थे और वहां मेडिसन देने का काम हम लोगों ने किया था । जब श्री पी.वी. नरसिंहराव जी प्रधानमंत्री थे। उस समय उनकी मदद से हम लोगों ने करीब 6 करोड़ रुपए की दवाइयां ह्यूमेनेटेरियन कंसीडरेशन पर इराक में बांटी थीं और वहां के हालात देखने के बाद हम लोगों ने काफी अफसोस ज़ाहिर किया था ।

महोदय, अब 1990 से लेकर आज वर्ष 2002 चल रहा है और अमरीका ने अभी तक ऐमबार्गो लिफ्ट नहीं किया है । हमें नैगोशियेशन करके जल्द से जल्द वहां अच्छे हालात बनाने का काम करना चाहिए । अब इराक में यू.एन. के लोग भी आए हैं । हमें अच्छा माहौल पैदा करने के लिए इस काम में उन्हें पूरा सहयोग देना है । आज इराक में हम लोगों ने किया है जिससे वहां अच्छे हालात हो जाएंगे। इजरायल में, फिलिस्तीन में और इराक में अच्छा माहौल होगा तो इंटरनेशनल मार्केट में ऑयल के प्राइस कम होने के बहुत चांसेस हैं। जब ऑयल की प्राइस इंटरनेशनल मार्केट में कम होगी तो उसका फायदा हिन्दुस्तान मार्केट को भी मिलेगा। अगर वहां अच्छा शांति का माहौल होगा तो हिन्दुस्तान में भी उसका अच्छा असर पड़ेगा। आज जो हम गंभीर हालात से गुजर रहे हैं तो जब वहां हालात कूल हो जाएंगे तो उसका भी असर यहां पर पड़ेगा। आज दोनों सदनों के जितने भी सीनियर लीडर्स हैं जसवंत सिंह जी, मनमोहन सिंह जी हैं, नटवर सिंह जी तथा जितने भी पहले फाइनेंस और एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर रहे हैं, उन सभी को एक अच्छा आइडिया है तथा अभी जो हमारे एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर श्री यशवंत सिन्हा जी हैं, उसमें भी वह एक अच्छा रोल अदा करेंगे तथा हिन्दुस्तान में एक अच्छा माहौल पैदा करेंगे तथा इसको कंटीन्यू रखेंगे। धन्यवाद।

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal): Sir, our leader, Shri S. Ramachandran Pillai was to speak on this subject, but he has fallen ill. That is why I am speaking on this subject.

Sir, I support the speech made by my esteemed colleague Shri Pranab Mukherjee. He has raised the discussion at a proper time and proper moment. I believe this discussion which is going on would help in consolidating our position so far as our foreign policy in general and our policy in regard to West Asia in particular are concerned. It is our general

policy of friendship with the West Asian countries which is being followed since the very beginning. There is not much diversion in our policy. Basically, we are following the same policy which we have been following since Independence. But there is a danger. Gradually, a threat of getting drifted is being created. Kindly look at the speech made by the hon. Prime Minister on 19th November. Sir, such a speech has been made after a very long time. He has given a hint -- no direct intervention -- that one super power is dictating terms all over the world. India had played a major role when we had a bi-polar world; one part was led by the Soviet Union and the other was led by America. At that point of time, India had taken a leading position so far as the Third World was concerned, so far as the Non-aligned Movement was concerned. We were hearing of three blocs; Soviet bloc, American bloc and the Non-aligned bloc led by India and other countries. When the bi-polar world was converted into a unipolar world, the position taken by India and the Third World nations got weakened. As a result, these people, USA and others, got much more courage, and a kind of desperation developed in their camp. Also, since the Soviet Bloc had collapsed, American Bloc is trying to take revenge on the world, particularly, on India and many of the Third World nations. We know, we were students of economics at that point of time. They were dictating terms to us that there should be no industrialisation in any of the Third World countries. We were asked to grow only agricultural products, not industrial. No help came during the First Five-Year Plan. And, it was because of the support we got from the Soviet Union that industrialisation took place in the country. Now, the Soviet Union is no more there. The Non-aligned Movement is almost non-existent. Therefore, they are taking revenge on the entire Third World nations, especially the West Asian countries this policy is dictated towards that end. This is the global approach. It may fall on any country. They will dictate terms to our Prime Minister. They will dictate terms to us as to what should be our Foreign Policy, whether one country will be segregated or not segregated; they will dictate to us as to what should be the economic policy of our country. If you go back to the earlier War, which took place in Iraq, at that time the Soviet Union was just collapsing. In that War, thousands of people were killed. They were not happy even after all this killing. They put an embargo, a blockade and it has been continuing for more than a decade. There is no world opinion against it. We visited Baghdad, under the leadership of our Deputy Chairperson, Madam Najma Heptulla, and there, we saw that because of the embargo, because of the blockade, common, ordinary people and children were being affected.

There was shortage of medicines and so on. Are they claim that they are the most civilised country of the world; and they think that they can teach the entire world what is civilisation, what is culture? And, so far the position of our country is concerned, I remember, initially, that delegation was supposed to be led by our Prime Minister. America did not wish, it did not like it. Immediately, we changed our stand and we decided that Madam Najma Heptulla would lead the delegation. This signifies the inherent weakness which is coming in to our Non-aligned Movement. Sir, in India, despite all political differences, despite all the fight between us, between the Treasury Benches and the Opposition, at least the non-alignment policy has been the cardinal point of our Foreign Policy, and there has been national consensus on that. Unfortunately, under the leadership of the present regime, that national consensus is breaking down. Probably, that economic line is now diluting our Foreign Policy and compelling us to compromise on our Foreign Policy. Since even on economic questions, we are dependent on the U.S.A. and the First World nations, America is dictating terms to us and we have came to the conclusion that unless the Guru helps, nothing would come. Therefore on our Foreign Policy also, on our military policy also, we are compromising. Now, every week, we hear on the television and on the radio that there would be joint-military exercises by India and America, in our waters. One day, we hear that there will be *"aar-paar ladai"* with Pakistan. The next day, we hear that there would be joint-military exercises by Pakistan and the U.S.A. What kind of a policy is this? I do not understand. Therefore, we say, Sir, that economics generally guides all other policies. Economic is the mirror of a general policy. Probably, our surrender in the matter of economic policy is compelling us to compromise in our Foreign Policy too and that compromise is making us irrelevant in the world scenario. India led the Non-Aligned Movement and we had a position, independent of the position of the then Soviet bloc and the American bloc. And, unless that position is re-established, re-created, and mobilisation takes place, that will cause a serious damage to the world nations too. Now, what does the people demand today? The people in the Third World nations want a strong Non-aligned leadership of a country like India. I believe that our conflict with Pakistan will never end unless we take an independent position, a leading position, in the Third World so far as international issues and non-alignment are concerned. Therefore, I believe, the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister, though very meak, is a beginning, and now, India should go ahead and pick up the track left

3.00 p.m.

behind by Late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Smt. Indira Gandhi. I remember having read some time back that when Smt. Indira Gandhi had gone to Washington after the war, and was to meet the U.S. President, Mr. Nexon, she did not meet him when she came to know of their intervention. I believe that India has to take an independent position, find the old track, go ahead and take a leading position so far as Non-Aligned Movement and the Palestinian movement and Iraq affairs are concerned. An unequivocal statement must come that the embargo should be withdrawn, that the blockade should be withdrawn, that there should not be any unilateral intervention. Sir, it is the U.S. which is dictating the U.N.O. too about what resolutions should be adopted and so on. Therefore, our country should take a strong position and say that the blockade should be withdrawn. No unilateral war should be declared against Iraq. And, if that happens, all the Third World nations under the leadership of India should oppose it seriously. So far as the Palestinian issue is concerned, there should be a demand that all blockades against Palestinians should be withdrawn. They have nothing to do to dictate who should be the leader of the Palestine or who should not be the leader there.

With these words, Sir, I once again thank Pranabda for raising a discussion on such an important issue. And, I believe, that our country will take the old track so far as non-alignment is concerned.

श्री मोती लाल वोरा (मध्य प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, विश्व शांति और सुरक्षा को खतरा पहुंचाने वाली पश्चिम एशिया में उत्पन्न गंभीर स्थिति पर आज हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं । मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि जो विदेश नीति रही आज़ादी के बाद, पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू के नेतृत्व में, जिस विदेश नीति को हमने उस वक्त अपनाया और दुनिया के तमाम देशों ने भारत की विदेश नीति की इसलिए प्रशंसा की कि हमारी विदेश नीति के पीछे बहुत साफ था कि हम गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं और उसके साथ-साथ पंडित जी के शब्दों में ही "उस समय जिससे हमने अपने मज़बूत कदम, सक्षम पहल, पूरी दुनिया में साम्राज्यवाद, उपनिवेशवाद, रंगभेद का विरोध करने के बाद भी हमें अलग-थलग पड़ने का कहीं डर नहीं था, उस समय औपनिवेशिक बेड़ियों में जकड़े देश, न स्वाधीन राष्ट्र, दुनिया के स्वाधीनता समर्थक न्यायप्रिय लोग उनकी ओर न केवल आशा भरी नज़रों से देख रहे थे बल्कि उनके पीछे खड़े थे ।" यह विदेश नीति थी उस आदर्श पुरुष की, जो आदर्श दृष्टि थी उनकी और दुनिया के तमाम देशों ने इसको स्वीकार किया था ।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज विश्व के सामने जो चुनौतियां हैं, खतरा है, विशेषकर उन दो बातों को लेकर है जिसका उल्लेख अभी प्रणब जी ने और अन्य वक्ताओं ने किया है। सोवियत रूस के विघटन के बाद विश्व के अंदर अमरीका ने अपने आपको एक मात्र ऐसा देश घोषित करने का प्रयत्न किया जिससे वह जो कहे उसके अनुसार ही दुनिया के लोग काम करें। लेकिन उन्हें इस बात को याद रखना होगा कि आज चाहे अमेरिका हो या दुनिया के

अन्य देश हों या तीसरी दुनिया के देश हों, उनको इस बात का पूरा अधिकार है कि वे दुनिया में इस प्रकार की तबाही मचने न दें और विश्व में किस प्रकार शांति स्थापित हो सकती है इस बात को ध्यान में रखें। इराक का ही मामला ले लें, फिलिस्तीन का मामला ले लें। इराक के मामले में अमेरिका आए दिन जिस प्रकार की धमकियां देता रहा, बमबारी करने की कोशिश की और वहां पर इमबारगो लगाया गया क्या। दुनिया के सभ्य कहे जाने वाले देश इस प्रकार की हरकतों को बर्दाश्त कर सकते हैं। महोदय, केवल इराक का ही सवाल नहीं है, उसके साथ खाड़ी देशों का सवाल है, अरब कंट्रीज का सवाल है और इस सवाल के रहते हुए अमेरिका उन देशों को किस नजर से देखता है। वह कहता है कि ये सब लोग जंगली हैं, गंवार हैं और पीछे हैं। अमेरिका आज जिस भाषा का उपयोग कर रहा है, अगर फिलिस्तीन के मामले में देखें तो फिलिस्तीन के मामले में राष्ट्रसंघ का जो निर्णय था, उस निर्णय को क्रियान्वित करने की दिशा में आज अगर कोई अड़ंगा लगा रहा है, राष्ट्रसंघ पर जो अपना प्रभुत्व जमाना चाहता है, जर्मनी और फ्रांस के विरोध के बाद भी अमेरिका इस बात की जुर्रत कर सकता है कि वह जो चाहेगा इराक में कर सकता है, फिलिस्तीन में कर सकता है। आज भारत की विदेश नीति जो प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कही है, मैं समझता हूं कि हमारी विदेश नीति को हमें बहुत असरदार ढंग से दुनिया के उन तमाम देशों को बताना होगा जिनके बारे में हम आज तक कहते आए हैं। सवाल इस बात का है कि आखिर दुनिया के जो तमाम देश हैं, क्या किसी अन्य देश को इस बात का अधिकार दिया जा सकता है कि उस देश का शासनाध्यक्ष कौन होगा? इराक और क्यूबा के मामले में अमेरिका की जिस तरह की चौधराहट चल रही है, जिसे हम कहें कि दादागिरी की जिस भाषा का उपयोग अमेरिका लगातार करता आ रहा है, क्या यह दुनिया के अंदर शांति की स्थापना करने की दिशा में कोई ऐसा कदम हो सकता है। मैं समझता हूं कि भारत की विदेश नीति के अंतर्गत हम अमेरिका को भी इस बात को कहें और इसे इस बात को समझाएं। जो आज संकट पैदा हुआ है इसका निराकरण हम अपनी विदेश नीति के माध्यम से ही कर सकते हैं। पश्चिमी एशिया का संकट केवल फिलिस्तीन नहीं है बल्कि जैसा मैंने कहा कि समूचे खाड़ी के देश भी शामिल हों। आतंकवाद से हमें लड़ना है। मुझे अपने विदेश मंत्री जी की एक बात अच्छी लगी। वे अभी ब्रिटेन गए थे और उन्होंने इस बात को कहा कि ब्रिटेन और अमेरिका को हमें नसीहत देने का यह अधिकार नहीं रहा। आज पाकिस्तान के अंदर तो आतंकवाद दिखता है लेकिन जम्मू-कश्मीर में आतंकवाद उन्हें दिखाई नहीं पड़ता। तो आज वह अधिकार ब्रिटेन और अमेरिका ने सचमुच खो दिया है। आज जो भी स्थिति पैदा हुई है जम्मू-कश्मीर के अंदर, हम इस बात को देख रहे हैं कि पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति के लगातार, निरंतर कहने के बाद भी कि आतंकवाद समाप्ति की ओर है कहीं भी ऐसा अंदाजा नहीं लगता है। जो घटनाएं अभी देश के अंदर हुई हैं। महोदय, मेरा कहना है कि भारत ने उपनिवेशवाद के विरुद्ध संघर्ष की बात हमने कही थी। पड़ौसियों के साथ हमारी गहरी मित्रता रही है। आज हमारी श्रीलंका और अफगानिस्तान के साथ अच्छी मित्रता है। हमने अफगानिस्तान से अपने रिश्तों को भी मजबूत बनाया है लेकिन पाकिस्तान को क्या हो गया है। आए दिन पाकिस्तान की तरफ से जिस प्रकार की बात कही जा रही है, जिस प्रकार का प्रचार किया जा रहा है, उससे लगता है कि भारत को केवल उसे ललकारने की बात नहीं कहनी है, हमें दिखलाना होगा कि भारत में वह शक्ति है, भारत अपनी शक्ति के आधार पर पाकिस्तान को इस प्रकार की हरकत करने से रोकने के लिए पूरी तरह से सक्षम है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं केवल एक बात को मानता हूं और वह है पं. जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी की विदेश नीति । उस विदेश नीति का हम आज भी लगभग पालन करते आ रहे हैं । आज अगर हम जरा सा कहीं हटे हैं तो

दुनिया में हमारा सम्मान कम हुआ है । हम अमरीका के पिछलग्गू नहीं हैं । हम इस बात को जानते हैं कि श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने 1971 में जब सातवें बेड़े के बारे में कहा तब हमने एक नया इतिहास नहीं बल्कि एक नया भूगोल रचा था । हमने एक नया भूगोल बनाया था और बांग्लादेश की स्थापना हुई थी । हममें शक्ति थी । हमारे देश की शक्ति को दुनिया के तमाम देशों ने मंजूर किया था । आज कोई कारण नहीं है कि हम किसी भी मामले में कमजोर होकर उनके सामने घुटने टेकने की बात नहीं कहते हैं । हमारे देश का अपना सम्मान है । उस सम्मान को कायम रखने की जिम्मेदारी भी हमारे अपने देशवासियों पर है । मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि हम उस नीति पर चल रहे हैं । आज दुनिया के घटनाक्रमों में जो बदलाव आया है, उस बदलाव को ध्यान में रखते हुए हमें इस बात को सोचना होगा कि आज दुनिया में जिन देशों में साम्राज्यवादी अहंकार है, जो विश्वशांति और सहअस्तित्व को खतरा उत्पन्न करने के लिए पूरी तरह से लगे हैं। राष्ट्रपति बुश एक महाशक्ति के रूप में उभरना चाहते हैं, मैं सोचता हूं कि शीत युद्ध के बाद आज जो स्थितियां दुनिया के अंदर पैदा हुई हैं, अगर दुनिया की उन सारी स्थितियों को ध्यान में रखते हुए हमें काम करना है तो निश्चित रूप से चाहे वह अमेरिका हो, चाहे वह ब्रिटेन हो, वह भारत के अंदरूनी मामलों में किसी प्रकार की दखलंदाजी करने की जुर्रत नहीं करेगा । अमेरिका से एक विदेश मंत्री आता है, उपमंत्री आता है, वह कहता है कि अब आतंकवाद में धीरे-धीरे कमी आई है, लेकिन दूसरे दिन ही देख लीजिए कि पाकिस्तान से आतंकवाद की शुरूआत होती है । क्या हम अमेरिका के ऊपर इतने निर्भर हैं ? अमेरिका के ऊपर इतना निर्भर न रहते हुए, अमेरिका को यह ध्यान रखना होगा कि आज उसकी जो स्थिति है, तालिबान को लेकर, अल कायदा को लेकर, फिलीस्तीन को लेकर जो नरसंहार हुआ है, जो तबाही हुई है, उस तबाही के लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है ? अमेरिका ही जिम्मेदार है । उस तबाही को ध्यान में रखते हुए हम अपनी विदेश नीति को उसी ढंग से प्रचारित करें । प्रचार के माध्यम से हम यह कहें कि गुटनिरपेक्ष देश होने के नाते हमारी यह नीति है । उस नीति के रहते हुए ही हम दुनिया के तमाम देशों में सहअस्तित्व की भावना, शांति की भावना, प्रेम की भावना स्थापित करना चाहते हैं । युद्ध के नगाड़े बज सकते हैं । तीसरा युद्ध होने में अब समय नहीं लग सकता । जिस तरह से हथियारों की होड़ दुनिया के अंदर हो रही है, साम्राज्यवादी देशों के अंदर हो रही है, इस हथियारों की होड़ को समाप्त करने का एक ही रास्ता है और वह है गांधी जी का बताया हुआ शांति का रास्ता । विश्व में शांति की स्थापना की दिशा में हमारा प्रयास रहा तो वह दिन दूर नहीं जब फिर से हमारी वही हैसियत अन्य देशों के अंदर बनेगी । अमेरिका को इस बात का विश्वास होना चाहिए कि हमने अमेरिका को बराबर सहयोग दिया है । जब कभी ऐसा वक्त आया तो भारत ने अपनी प्रभुसत्ता को हमेशा ध्यान में रखा है। जो हमारे देश के हित के लिए उचित है, उसे हम पूरी तरह से लागू करने में पीछे नहीं रहेंगे । आज उसी नीति पर चलने की आवश्यकता है । मुझे पूरा यकीन है कि आज की बदली हुई परिस्थितियों में भी हम विश्व में फिर से वही स्थान प्राप्त कर सकते हैं । कहीं पर कुछ कमजोरियां नजर आती हैं लेकिन वे कमजोरियां हम खुद मिल-बैठकर, मिल-जुलकर दूर कर सकते हैं । सलाह-मशविरे के माध्यम से हम इन बातों को तय कर सकते हैं। आवश्यकता आज इस बात की है कि आज अमेरिका का जो रुख है, दुनिया के अंदर दो बातों की विशेष रूप से चर्चा हो रही है । इराक की चर्चा और फिलीस्तीन की चर्चा। इसके अलावा छोटे-मोटे विवाद हो सकते हैं लेकिन इन विवादों का भी एक शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से हल निकाला जा सकता है । मुझे विश्वास है कि हम इस दिशा में अग्रसर होंगे। धन्यवाद ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया): श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र। आपके पास आठ मिनट हैं।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश) : थोड़ा सा बढ़ा दीजिएगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। हम लोग इराक के प्रति अमेरिका के रुख की चर्चा कर रहे हैं। उससे भी गंभीर बात यह हो गयी है कि अमेरिका के रुख के कारण संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ का वर्चस्व समाप्त होने वाला है। यह अपने डिक्टेशन पर दुनिया की पंचायत चलाना चाहता है। ऐसा समय एक बार हिटलर के जमाने में आया था। हिटलर जैसे ही सत्ता में आया जर्मनी लीग आफ नेशंस से बाहर चला गया। ठीक वही समय इस समय बुश के जमाने में आ रहा है। यह कई बार धमकी देता है कि अगर हमारी बात नही मानी गयी तो हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ से अलग हो जाएंगे। भारत सरकार को, भारत को, सम्पूर्ण एशिया को और सम्पूर्ण दुनिया को इस पर गंभीरता से सोचना होगा कि अगर यह दुनिया की पंचायत ही नही रहेगी तो हम इराक पर, अफगानिस्तान पर या भारत पर बहस क्या करेंगे। अगर अमेरिका दादागिरी करना चाहता है संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के सवाल पर तो दुनिया के दूसरे देशों को इकट्ठे होकर एक अलग मंच बना देना चाहिए जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की मान्यताओं के आधार पर दुनिया की पंचायत करने का बीड़ा ले। लेकिन यह बहुत दिन झेला नही जा सकता है।

कोई एक देश दौलत के मामले में धनी होगा तो दूसरे देश अपनी मजबूरी में उसके खिलाफ कड़ी बात नहीं बोलेगे। यह हम लोगों के गांव मे भी होता है, शहरों मे भी होता है। जहां कही धनी होते हैं कमजोर को दबा दिया करते हैं। उसकी निगाह तो झगड़ा-झंझट करने में किसी और चीज पर रहती है।

हमको एक दूसरी बात भी सोचनी पड़ेगी कि क्या जब कभी भी लड़ाइयां होगी तो केवल एशिया में ही होगी? हिटलर की लड़ाई जापान से लेकर अफगानिस्तान होते हुए इराक तक चली। हमेशा एशिया पर ही खतरा मंडराता रहेगा? यह तो एशिया के लोगों को सोचना पड़ेगा कि हम ही लड़ाई का मैदान क्यों बन रहे हैं, कुरुक्षेत्र क्यों बन रहे हैं? कहीं और क्यों नही बनता? कोई यूरोप का देश क्यों नहीं बनता? अमेरिका का देश क्यों नहीं बनता? यहां तक कि अफ्रीका वाले भी नहीं बनते। हम एशिया वाले ही बार-बार बन जाते हैं। इस सवाल को सोचने के लिए एशिया के सभी देशों को जिनसे हमारे संबंध बुरे हैं उनको भी बुलाना होगा कि कितने दिनों तक हम युद्ध स्थल बने रहेगे।

युद्ध के क्या नुक्सान होते हैं इसका विश्लेषण मैं आज नही करूंगा। इराक एशिया मे है। इराक में तेल का बहुत बड़ा भंडार है। जार्ज बुश, हमको बताया गया था कि किसी तेल की कंपनी में पहले नौकरी करते थे। खमख्वाह उनकी निगाह तेल पर बहुत जाती होगी। अफगानिस्तान के बाहर जो बाल्टिक सागर वगैरह है वहां भी थोड़ा बहुत तेल निकलता है। तो तेल ढूंढने के लिए इन्सान की जिंदगी को बरबाद न करें। भारत सरकार को कड़ा रुख लेना चाहिए।

स्वेज नहर के राष्ट्रीयकरण के समय कर्नल नासिर ने किसी से पूछा नहीं था। उस समय टीटो थे। उस समय नेहरू थे। हिम्मत करके इन लोगों ने राष्ट्रीयकरण का समर्थन कर दिया। फौजें किनारे खड़ी रह गयीं। भारत सरकार को पता नहीं क्यों काठ मार गया। हिम्मत कर ही नहीं पा रहे हैं। बोलना पड़ेगा कि पलटन का इस्तेमाल जखीरे पर नहीं होगा। इराक ने बहुत हथियारों का जखीरा इकट्ठा कर लिया है और यह, वह देश उपदेश दे रहा है जिसके पास दुनिया का सबसे बड़ा हथियारों का जखीरा है। जो चाहे कर सकता है।

हम लोगों के यहां अभी जो एक छोटा-सा परीक्षण हुआ तो बहुत सख्त रूप दिखलाया, कहा कि तुम पर बहुत-सी पाबंदियां लगा दी जाएंगी अगर यह हरकत करोगे। लगायी भी गयी। कौन पाबंदी लगाएगा उस मालिक पर जिसने दुनिया का सबसे बड़ा जखीरा रखा है? और इस पर बहस होनी चाहिए कि अगर हथियार खतरनाक हैं तो वह भारत रखता है, इराक रखता है या अमरीका रखता है, सभी हथियार खतरनाक हैं और इस पर दुनिया की पंचायत में गंभीरता से बहस होनी चाहिए । इस तरह से एक बहाना ले करके कि इराक के पास अथाह हथियार हो गए, इसलिए उस पर हमला करना जरूरी है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र पर जिस तरह से दबाव डाला गया, यह तो गनीमत कहिए कि किसी तरह, मैं तारीफ करूंगा इराक की असेंबली के लोगों की कि अमरीका के प्रस्ताव को एक स्वर से उन्होंने इंकार किया । हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट क्या एक स्वर से अमरीका के खिलाफ कभी इस तरह से खड़ी हो सकती है ? राज्य सभा के सदस्यों से मेरा यह दूसरा सवाल है । उन्होंने सद्दाम के ऊपर छोड़ दिया कि तुम जो चाहो मानो । उसने पर्यवेक्षकों के लिए मान लिया और पर्यवेक्षक वहां गए हैं । लेकिन उनके जाने के बाद भी, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हथियारों से लैस अमरीका के जहाजी बेड़े समुद्र में तैर रहे हैं । वे भारत की सीमा के भीतर से गुजरने वाले हैं । यशवंत जी इस समय तो विदेश मंत्री हैं, उस समय वित्त मंत्री थे, चन्द्रशेखर जी की सरकार थी । ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम (उत्तरांचल): आप भी थे ।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : हां, हम भी उस सरकार में थे । हम कहां भाग रहे हैं ।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : याद दिला रहे हैं ।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : हमको याद है । जब यशवंत जी का याद है तो अपना भी याद है और आपका भी याद है । तो हम लोगों ने गलती से एक लड़ाई के जहाज में पेट्रोल दे दिया था, उसके लिए इजाजत दे दी थी । हिन्दुस्तान की जनता ने हम लोगों को कहीं का नहीं रखा । जनता बहुत बड़ा जॅज हुआ करती है । सत्ता मे बैठे हुए लोगों की एक भूल किस सीमा तक जनता के जजमेंट में आती है इसका अंदाज हम तो मन ही मन लगाते रहते हैं, क्योंकि उस सरकार में थे । भारत की सीमा से कोई भी समुद्री बेड़ा इराक की तरफ युद्ध के लिए न जाए भारत सरकार को इस पर कड़ा रुख लेना चाहिए । वैसे समुद्री बेड़ा चलता रहे, न चले, कोई मतलब नहीं होता, लेकिन हमारी सरहद से नहीं जाना चाहिए । अगर सरहद से आपने इजाजत दे दी तो एक तरह से अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से आपकी भागीदारी हो गई । कोई चोर चोरी करने के लिए किसी तीसरे के घर में जाए और हमारे दरवाजे बंदूक बजाता हुआ जाए, हम उसको मना न करें

कि हमारे दरवाजे के सामने से मत जाओ, तो हमारी भागीदारी मानी जाएगी । यह अपराधवृत्ति का सामान्यत: नियम है । वह रोकना पड़ेगा । दूसरी बात जो बहुत गंभीर हो गई है, वह है उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय ... *(समय की घंटी)* अभी 8 मिनट तो नहीं हुए होंगे ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया) : आलरेडी साढे नौ मिनट हो गए हैं ।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : इस समय हम अखबार में जॉर्ज बुश के बारे मे पढ रहे थे । इंग्लैंड में कोई सर्वे हुआ था । उस संगठन का नाम था "चैनल फॉर न्यूज़" । उसमें 33 सैंकड़ा लोगों ने यह कहा कि बुँश खतरनाक आदमी है, 33 सैंकड़ा लोगों ने कहा कि इस पर विश्वास नहीं किया जा सकता और 46 सैंकड़ा लोगो ने अपने प्रधान मंत्री टोनी ब्लेयर को जॉर्ज बुश का पिछलग्गू कहा । अगर हमारे समुद्र से युद्ध का जहाजी बेड़ा चला गया और कोई सर्वे हो गया तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को क्या कहा जाएगा ? क्या कहा जाएगा, हम अपनी तरफ से कोई शब्द इस्तेमाल नहीं कर रहे हैं । दुनिया इस तरह की घटनाओं पर सर्वे कर रही है, राय बना रही है। हमें यहां पर बहादुर और वीर बनने की जरूरत है और भाषण से वीर नहीं, बल्कि कर्म से वीर। यह मैंने इसलिए कह दिया कि यह इंग्लैंड में अभी-अभी हुआ है । हम अखबार में पढ रहे थे, हम को अगर वीर बनना है तो कम-से-कम इस लांछन से तो बचना ही पड़ेगा, जहाजी बेड़े को रोकना पड़ेगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आखिरी बात कहकर समाप्त करूंगा कि भारत में ईराक के राजदूत ने एक जलसे में कहा है कि पाकिस्तान से युद्ध के समय, इन सारे संबंधों में बिगाड के समय, ईराक की सरकार ने और यहां की जनता ने दुनिया के मुस्लिम समुदाय के विरोध के बावजूद भारत का साथ दिया था । यह आज या कल के अखबार मे मैंने पढा है। महोदय, अब अगर यह सच है और यह सच है भी तो धार्मिक कट्टरपंथ दुनिया में कितना बढ़ा है, हमारे देश में कितना बढ़ा है, इसे हम लोग जानते हैं और उस विरोध के बावजूद अगर कोई राष्ट्र खड़ा होकर भारत के समर्थन में अपनी बात करता है तो बेलाग, हिम्मत के साथ भारत को भी चाहिए कि वह ईराक के पक्ष में और अमेरिका के खिलाफ खुला बयान दे। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA): Mr. P.G. Narayanan. You have five minutes.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Okay, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Iraq is being threatened with a war once again. The allegation against Iraq is that it is has weapons of mass destruction, it is a threat to its neighbours and it has links with terrorist outfits such as Al Qaeda. Sir, we have to see whether these allegations are true or not. I submit that these allegations are not based on facts. The United Nations inspection regime destroyed the Iraqi military machine and the United Nations sanctions deprived Iraq of money even to feed its population. The International Atomic Energy Agency in its most recent report has categorically stated that

Iraq no more has a nuclear weapons programme. Last month President Vladimir Putin declared that Russia had not seen any evidence of Iraq developing weapons of mass destruction. Several UN weapons inspectors who monitored every major Iraqi industrial activity during the period from 1991 to 1998 have categorically stated that Iraq does not possess weapons of mass destruction and that it has no more the capacity to produce such weapons. Iraq no longer has the necessary infrastructure or access to technology. Iraq is willing to allow UN weapons inspectors and give them unrestricted access to all its facilities so that no doubt remains in this regard and further negates the American claim. The Iraqi Government is an authoritarian regime and a one party rule of the Baath Party. It is for the people of a country to chart their own future and decide the form of Government which they find suitable without outside intervention. The core ideology of the Baath Party is secularism, socialism and pan-Arab nationalism.

Religious extremism and fundamentalist organisations are dealt with ruthlessly in Iraq. The Baath Party of Iraq has an unblemished secular record and the possibility of any co-operation between the Iraqi Government and Al-Qaeda terrorist outfit did never arise. The Government of Iraq did not recognize the Taliban Regime in Afghanistan...(*time-bell*)...Sir, I have not taken even two minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA): Your allotted time is over...(*Interruptions*)...I am going by the time. You can take two more minutes.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN: I will take just three more minutes. Just like India, Iraq also granted recognition to the Government-in-exile of Prof. Rabbani as the legitimate Government in Kabul. Iraq, today, poses no threat to any country. The Arab nations, unanimously, endorsed a Resolution opposing any attack on Iraq at the Beirut Summit.

The Gulf war of 1991 resulted in the imposition of crippling sanctions against Iraq which continue to this date. The MoU agreed upon by the Government of Iraq and the U.N. in 1996, known as "Oil-for-Food Programme" softened the sanctions. The situation is far from adequate substitution for normal economic activity. After the Gulf War, there has

been a manifold increase in cancer and premature births in Iraq. It has gone up from 4.5 per cent to 32 per cent, according to one UNICEF Report.

We should not forget that the Government of Iraq has extended its firm support to India on Kashmir issue and opposes the use of religion as a criterion for determining nation states. A war against Iraq will seriously jeopardise India's strategic interests. It will strengthen the terrorist cause and open the doors to international anarchy. Sovereignty of Iraq or any other country should not be undermined by outside force. So, there is no need for waging a war against Iraq. So, US should think and act instead of rushing to fulfil its own objectives and interests.

The Government of India should co-ordinate with the Non-Aligned Movement, the European Union and the Arab League to prevent this war. India should also strongly urge the Security Council to end the economic sanctions against Iraq so as to restore the health and the well-being of Iraqi people. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA): Mr. Virumbi. Your party has been allotted five minutes. Please stick to that time. At least, there is no competition on this subject.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu) : I will take only that much time which has been taken by my colleague.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA) : No, no. You take five minutes. Give him some relief.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Short Duration Discussion brought before us is, 'on the grave situation arising in West Asia threatening world peace and security'.

We have to look at the situation from the world peace and security angle. Everybody knows that India had, has and will have cordial relations with the West Asian countries, particularly Iraq, because even in the Organisation of the Islamic Countries, Iraq stood by India. The situation, now, is that the present discussion is taking place because of the observations made on this issue by our hon. Prime Minister. Sir, India's stand is that one should not impose one's will on other countries; and Iraq

should comply with the UN Resolution, and destroy the weapons of mass destruction. Also, once the UN team is satisfied that Iraq has complied with the Resolution, the sanction against Iraq should be lifted. We say that because, otherwise, it will affect the peace and security of the region. On the eve of our Independence, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehruji founded the bipolar system. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru from India, Marshal Tito from Yugoslavia and Mr. Nasser from Egypt, were the architects of the non-aligned movement. When the Cold War is over, when liberalisation is taking place, there are bound to be differences of opinion among countries, and also, within a country. The developed countries have, so far, allowed only the free flow of capital. The developed countries have not allowed the free flow of labour throughout the world. Therefore, there is a difference of opinion. How is it going to affect the world? Iraq owes to Russia 8 billion dollars. Russia has got a contract for rehabilitation of the oilfields in Iraq. Some of the important oilfields are West Qurna - the richest deposit in the world -, Majnoo and Nahr Umar. When it is so, Russia has got an economic interest in Iraq. That is also a point. We will have to see to it. Now, the UN team has inspected. Today, through the electronic media, we came to understand that the UN Team is satisfied with its inspection. I do not know whether they are thoroughly satisfied, because there was a condition that they should not enter the mosques and the palace of Saddam Hussain. We also do not know whether the UN Team had complied with the conditions put forth by Iraq. But, the report is that the UN Team is satisfied with its inspection. But, I would like to emphasise on the point that despite the fact that the UN Team is satisfied, one is not sure whether the war against Iraq will be averted or not. It is a question of debate. Why do I say so? I would like to point out that in the first week of May, there was information from the US...*(Time-bell)* I will take only three minutes, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, I would like to quote from *The Hindu*. The UN Secretary of State, Collin Powell, on Sunday, the 7th May, 2002, said, "The Bush Administration's policy on leadership change in Iraq is separate, distinct, different, from allowing the weapons to be inspected in Iraq." That means, the inspection has been delinked from the question leadership change in Iraq. That is why we have a doubt in our mind whether the war against Iraq would be averted or not, despite the fact that the UN Team is satisfied with its inspection. Sir, they further say, "The United States reserves its opinion to do, whatever it believes might be appropriate to see if there can be a regime change. The U.S. policy is like this. Regardless of what the Inspectors do, I repeat, regardless of what the Inspectors do, the

people of Iraq; the people of the region would be better off with a different regime in Baghdad. This is what was announced by the Secretary of State, Mr. Collin Powell. So, even if the U.N. Inspection Team is satisfied, we doubt whether war could be averted. Now, what is the role of India in this? In this connection, the observations made by the hon. Prime Minister have been hailed throughout India, cutting across party-lines. But the point is, this observation should be translated into action. This is what we expect from the Government. The people of Iraq are suffering a lot. In order to save the people of Iraq, in fact, to save the people of all the developing countries, some basic facilities should be provided to them. In developing countries, unemployment is on the increase, and even basic facilities are not available there. In Iraq, even the life-saving drugs are not available, and they are suffering day in, day out. We want that India should become a permanent member of the Security Council. This is my suggestion. And we will always stand by the Government on this. I think the entire House will agree with me on this. *(Interruptions)*... If India becomes a permanent member of the Security Council, then, I think these type of things would be averted by veto. We should save the people of Iraq by restoring democracy there. We should see to it that multi-party system is restored there. It is for the people of Iraq and nobody else, to decide how to restore democracy there.

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN (Karnataka): Sir, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. The situation in West Asia is really grave and a cause of concern for all the peace-loving countries of the world, particularly, India. Whenever the world is threatened with war, India, as the Leader of the Non-Aligned Movement has played a pro-active role towards peace. I want to get an assurance from the hon. External Affairs Minister whether this time also, India, would play the same role, keeping this past tradition in mind. It is very clear from the utterances of the U.S Administration that it wants a war. I am afraid, even if the Weapon Inspectors give a clean chit to Iraq; even if they say that Iraq does not have chemical, biological or nuclear weapons, America will, definitely, find some excuse to create a situation for war. We have to be careful about this. We have very good relations with America. We should have good relations with America. But, at the same time, as hon. very senior leader, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee said, India has got an independent foreign policy. India has a role to play in the world community. We are the largest democracy in the world. We value democracy more than America. America plays a dual role

as far as its foreign policy is concerned. In certain countries, America wants to establish dictatorship and in certain other countries, it wants democracy. But, our role is not like that. We are the biggest democracy in the world. We are an independent country, and our policy should also be independent.

Why we should suspect America, because America kept quiet for 11 years. Weapon Inspectors used to visit there. Till 1998, it kept silent. But after 11th September, after the Afghan War, all of a sudden, America started thinking about Iraq. It has not yet been able to convince the world as to how it is threatened by Iraq. America has not identified Iraq with Al-Qaeda. America never said that Iraq is encouraging terrorism. The only charge it has made against Iraq was that it has biological or chemical weapons. If it has, then, definitely, it is a threat to the world. They ought to be destroyed. Except UK and US, no other member of the Security Council is really convinced about this. They have voted, by force, for this Resolution. In that situation, we have seen what sort of catastrophe the earlier wars have brought on the people of Iraq. Nearly five lakh children died. Every month, 4,500 children are dying. Does the United Nations have no role to play? Should we be a silent spectator to what is happening and all that, despite the best relations we want to maintain? What are we doing? On the one hand, America says that if the UN Resolution is not adhered to by Iraq, it will wage a war. On the other, they are silent when Palestine and Israel are violating the UN Resolutions. Israel has thrown many such UN Resolutions into the dustbin, but America never voiced its concern. So, where America has its own vested interests, it is okay. Might is right. But that should not happen. So, what is required on the part of India is a pro-active role? The whole world is looking at us. If super power threatens small nations, we must come to the rescue of those nations. We have the best relations with West Asia. Therefore, it is very important even from the security point of view. In West Asia, most of the countries are Islamic countries. At this juncture, they need our help and support. We must support them, because Pakistan is acting through the Organisation of Islamic Countries (OIC). In West Asia, we need to play a pro-active role to convince those countries that Pakistan is wrong, that it is harbouring terrorists. We have to take those countries into confidence. We are having the best relations with those countries. Once we are able to convince those countries, Pakistan will be weakened and isolated. This is another aspect which we have to look into. I would like India to play a pro-active role in Palestine also. The manner in which the Israel is attacking, the way it is occupying the places

which were, earlier, under the control of Palestine, I think, we need to play a pro-active role. We must take up this matter with the United Nations. I fully agree with Mr. Virumbi when he says that we should get the permanent membership of the Security Council.

It is only India which can stand, and have a permanent membership. You have to be a permanent Member of the Security Council because, we are the largest democratic country in the world, and we should work towards that.

Sir, Iraq is already a suppressed country. How much are they going to suppress that country? I must congratulate the Foreign Minister, and our Prime Minister. There is a statement from the Prime Minister that 'nobody can interfere in the internal affairs of Iraq, and nobody can dictate as to who should be the ruler of a particular country.' It is a very bold statement on the part of our Prime Minister. We all stand by him. We should all see that as far as the Foreign Policy is concerned, we are all one. Our foreign policy is consistent. I am sure that India's voice will be heard. India will again emerge as the Leader of the Non-Aligned Movement, and will not allow any Super- Power, whether it is Russia or any other Super-Power or emerging Super-Power, to dictate the smaller nations or suppress the rights of other countries.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संतोष बागड़ोदिया) : श्रीमती सरोज दुबे। आपके पास पांच मिनट का समय है।

श्रीमती सरोज दुबे (बिहार) :माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं माननीय प्रणब मुखर्जी द्वारा उठाई गई चिंता से अपने आपको संबद्ध करते हुए कहना चाहती हूं कि पश्चिमी एशिया में जिस तरह के हालात पैदा हो रहे हैं उससे विश्व की शांति और सुरक्षा को गंभीर खतरा पैदा हो रहा है। विश्व शांति के लिए खतरा बने हुए राष्ट्रपति बुश इराक पर हमला करने की अपनी योजनाओं को लेकर सुरक्षा परिषद में हो रहे विरोध से बहुत खफा हैं। वे धमकी दे रहे हैं कि अगर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ ने वह भूमिका नहीं निभाई जिसकी अमेरिका को अपेक्षा है तो यह संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ का भी वही हश्र करेंगे जो लीग आफ नेशन्स का हुआ था। ...**(व्यवधान)**... यह एक तरह से विश्व बिरादरी को खुली चेतावनी है कि या तो वे अमेरिका का कहना मान लें या फिर अमेरिका संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ से बाहर हो जायेगा जिससे उस संस्था की व्यवस्था चरमरा जायेगी और उसका खात्मा हो जायेगा।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सभी जानते हैं कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की स्थापना का मूल कारण उसके घोषणा पत्र में यह था कि आने वाली पीढ़ियों को युद्ध की विभीषिका से

बचाया जाए। यह सच है कि 1945 के बाद से कोई महायुद्ध नही हुआ है, लेकिन तीन सौ युद्ध हुए जिनमें हजारों लोग मारे गये हैं जो तीसरी दुनिया के लोग थे। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के पांच बड़े देशों का यह मानना है कि उन्होंने दुनिया को युद्ध से बचा लिया है, जबकि वास्तविकता यह है कि ये सभी बड़े देश दुनिया में हथियारों की आपूर्ति और बिक्री में लगे रहे और अपने लिए आधुनिकतम विनाशकारी हथियार विकसित करते रहे और इनका अपने यहां बड़ा जखीरा बनाते रहे। इन्होंने ऐसा जखीरा बना लिया जो सचमुच में सारी दुनिया का कुछ सेकेंड में खात्मा कर सकता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पी0 प्रभाकर रेड्डी) पीठासीन हुए।

अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति बुश द्वारा अफगानिस्तान पर फतह करने के बाद अब उनकी इराक पर टेढ़ी नजर है। इनका प्रयास यह है कि विश्व के सभी कमजोर और छोटे देशों में उनके इशारे पर काम करने वाले राष्ट्राध्यक्ष हो जाएं ताकि जब भी ये कोई निर्णय ले तो सभी राष्ट्राध्यक्ष उनके साथ हां में हां मिलायें।

गत वर्ष 11 सितम्बर को अमेरिकी सैनिक ताकत का अड्डा पेंटागन तथा आर्थिक साम्राज्यवाद का अड्डा वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर की इमारतों पर जो उग्रवादी हमला हुआ, वह काफी दुखद था। लेकिन इससे अमेरिका की अर्थ और शक्ति का दम्भ चरमरा गया। विश्व के ताकतवर देश के अहंकार को जबरदस्त धक्का लगा। उसके बाद ही अफगानिस्तान में तालिबान के गढ को ध्वस्त करने के बाद अपने मन माफिक सरकार के हाथों में वहां की सत्ता सौंपकर उसका दूसरा पड़ाव इराक हो गया है।

जब राष्ट्रपति बुश ने इराक की जनता से अपील की कि यह सद्दाम को हटा दे तो वहां की जनता ने प्रतिकार स्वरुप सद्दाम हुसैन को सात साल के लिए अपने देश का शासन सौंप दिया । उसके बाद राष्ट्रपति बुश ने फिर अपना दूसरा पैंतरा बदल दिया और कहा कि विध्वंसक अस्त्र-शस्त्रों का बहुत बड़ा जखीरा सद्दाम हुसैन ने जमा कर रखा है जिससे विश्व शांति को बहुत खतरा है जबकि अमेरिका पर ऐसे आरोप रूस लगाता रहा है कि उनके यहां विध्वंसक अस्त्र-शस्त्रों का बहुत बड़ा जखीरा है लेकिन अपने गिरेबां में कभी अमेरिका ने झांकने की कोशिश नहीं की । लेकिन इराक ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र शस्त्र निरीक्षक समिति है, जिसमें 24 तकनीकी विशेषज्ञ भी शामिल हैं, हो सकता है अब तक उनका निरीक्षण हो गया हो, उनकी रिपोर्ट आ गई हो लेकिन उसके बाद भी राष्ट्रपति बुश के तेवर कुछ कम नहीं हुए हैं । अब वे किसी अन्य बहाने की तलाश में हैं । ऐसे समय में भारत के सामने एक बहुत बड़ी चुनौती है, उसको अपना मार्ग तय करना पड़ेगा कि वह कौन सी अहम भूमिका निभाए ताकि भारत विश्व के मंच पर एक बार फिर से उभर कर आ सके । इसी परिप्रेक्ष्य में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो बयान दिया, वह स्वागत योग्य है कि कुछ तो उन्होंने देश की गरिमा के अनुकूल कहा कि प्रत्येक राष्ट्र को अपनी सरकार चुनने का अधिकार है। राष्ट्र संपन्न हो या विपन्न लेकिन उसकी सम्प्रभुता में किसी को भी दखल नहीं देना चाहिए । यह देश की गरिमा के अनुकूल है लेकिन उन्होंने बहुत देर की । इससे पहले हम इराक के खिलाफ लगे अंतर्राष्ट्रीय प्रतिबंधों के संबंध में एक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर या किसी भी मंच पर कभी भी कुछ दबी जुबान से भी नहीं कह पाए जबकि

इराक ने हमेशा हमारी गाढ़े समय पर मदद की है । भारत पर जब-जब संकट आया, इराक हमारी बगल में खड़ा रहा । यह सभी जानते हैं कि इराक की बरबादी का सीधा-सीधा रिश्ता भारत की बरबादी से जुड़ा हुआ है । कमाल तो यह है, जैसे राष्ट्रपति बुश की इराक पर हमले की धमकी के साथ ही साथ आपने देखा होगा कि पेट्रोलियम के पदार्थों के दाम बढ़ने लगे हैं । इराक एक ऐसी ताकत है जिसके हमले पर सारे विश्व का दारोमदार निर्भर करता है । कमाल तो यह है कि ब्रिटेन को छोड़कर पूरा यूरोपियन समुदाय, यहां तक कि फ्रांस भी राष्ट्रपति बुश के साथ नहीं है। *(समय की घंटी)* अमेरिका के विदेश मंत्री भी उनके साथ नही हैं और बिना किसी की सहमति लिए अकेले इन्होंने अपनी घोषणा कर ली है और इनकी हठधर्मिता से सारे ही लोग परेशान हैं और ये संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ जैसी संस्था को खुलेआम चुनौती देकर अपने इशारे पर नचाना चाहते हैं । ब्रिटेन जो हर ककुर्म में अमरीका का साथ देने वाला साथी है, वे इन संस्थाओं को अपने हाथ का खिलौना बनाना चाहते हैं । तो भारत को भी अपनी भूमिका तय कर लेनी चाहिए और ऐसा न हो कि ऊहापोह की स्थिति यह हो जाए कि "दुविधा मे दोनों गए, माया मिली न राम "। तो इसलिए अमेरिका के खौफ के साए से आप बाहर आ जाएं और एक दृढ़ संकल्प के साथ विश्व के मंच पर खड़े होकर अपनी जो परंपरागत विदेश नीति है, उसके अनुकूल आप कार्य करें, उसके अनुकूल आप बात करें ताकि विश्व के मंच पर आपकी एक अलग पहचान बने और आपके पीछे जो कमज़ोर और अमेरिका के खौफ मे दबे राष्ट्र हैं, आपके पीछे-पीछे आकर खड़े हो सकें और आप उनकी अगुवाई कर सकें ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पी. प्रभाकर रेड्डी): सरोज दुबे जी, अब कृपया खत्म कीजिए । आपका पांच मिनट का समय था, आपको सात मिनट मिल चुके हैं ।

श्रीमती सरोज दुबे : बस थोड़ा सा और है । भारत को अपनी विदेश नीति पर अटल रहना चाहिए । हमारी विदेश नीति है सहअस्तित्व की, तटस्थता की और विश्व शांति का संदेश देने वाली, गुटनिरपेक्षता की । आपको याद होगा और मैं आपको याद दिलाना चाहूंगी कि श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने 113 गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों की अगुवाई करके पूरे विश्व में अपना झंडा गाड़ रखा था । तो आप भी उसी गौरवशाली देश की सरकार में हैं, उसी देश के विदेश मंत्री हैं, उसी देश के हमारे प्रधान मंत्री हैं, तो अब क्या हो गया है ? अब कौन सी बात है ? अब तो हम उस समय से बहुत अच्छी स्थिति में हैं । आपको भी चाहिए कि अपनी उस परंपरागत विदेश नीति को अपनाते हुए उसके अनुकूल कार्य करें और पूरे जो कमज़ोर और विकासशील राष्ट्र हैं, उनकी अगुवाई करें । इराक की मदद करें और अमेरिकी की दादागिरी को पूरे विश्व के मंच से आप हटा दें। देखिए, आपके इस दृढ़ कदम के पीछे पूरी दुनिया खड़ी हो जाएगी और आप इस देश में भारत का नाम ऊंचा करेंगे तभी भारत आगे बढ़ेगा। इसके साथ ही मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगी कि फिलिस्तीन और इजराइल का जो तनाव है उसमें भी आपको अपनी अहम भूमिका निभानी चाहिए। क्योंकि सभी को मालूम है कि यासर अराफात को शांति का पुरस्कार मिला और आज उनको सुरक्षा की आवश्यकता पड़ गई है। माननीय दोनों विदेश मंत्री यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं, ...(**व्यवधान**)... मैं बस यही निवेदन करना चाहती हूं कि भारत के लिए बहुत अच्छा मौका है। इस समय अमेरिकी की दादागिरी से पूरी दुनिया त्रस्त है और यूरोपीय समुदाय भी त्रस्त है। आपके लिए मौका है, अगर आप यह मौका चूक गए तो आपके लिए यह मौका दुबारा आने वाला नहीं है। आप एक बार फिर से भारत के गौरव को ऊंचा करिए, भारत के परचम को बहुत ऊंचा लहराइए और गरीब और विकसित देशों को आप मदद करिए।

4.00 p.m.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Shri V.V. Raghavan. You have three minutes' time.

SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN (Kerala) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, the time is ripe for our hon. Minister for External Affairs to take bold initiatives to mobilise the whole peace-loving forces and the nations to check the mad attempts of America and Britain to take this world to a devastating war. An attack on Iraq will not be confined to that. We must say, America should keep its hands off Iraq. The Palestinian people have a right to live on their own soil peacefully. They are being mercilessly attacked. That attack should stop. America can ask Israel to stop this war against the Palestinian. Sir, in the name of war against terror, the United States' calculated move is for world domination by military might and economic bondage. From Caspian Basin to Afghanistan, America wants to capture the entire oil belt. America wants to destroy Iraq because that country is an obstacle to their ambitious project of oil domination. Oil and arms manufacture are the two planks of the crisis-ridden American economy. That is why, this war cry. In the war against terrorism, we are a victim of American double talk and American double standards. General Musharraf thrives under the strong protective wings of American money and arms. In a way, America is cheating India. They say one thing, and they do another thing. This kind of double talk and double standards on war against terrorism must be stopped. Everybody knows, what is happening in Pakistan. Every time they say something and that is not fulfilled. Sir, both the Ministers are having some fun between themselves. Will they be kind enough to share that fun with us also? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH): We will share it with you at the time of the reply.

SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN: Okay. Sir, the American Government declares that they have every right to attack any country. They say: "We have the right to attack any country." They stamped some countries as rogue countries. Who have given them this right? Our voice is very powerful as far as peace is concerned. This is the time for us to tell America with all the emphasis at our command that this kind of dealings will not be tolerated

by the world. India's voice is very powerful. India can mobilise all the countries also. It is time for us to collectively say that they have no right to attack any country. They are taking for granted the United Nations also. So, this kind of attack and this kind of calculated move for world domination must be resisted. It concerns us; it concerns our economy; it concerns our existence. The war against terror is misinterpreted by America for their ambitious aim of world domination. If terror is called an attack on unarmed people, in that sense, America is the number one terrorist country, They are bombing Iraq even nowadays. While they sent inspection squads to Iraq, they attacked Iraq. After sending the inspection squads also, they bombed Iraq. So, this is the time for India to come forward and mobilise the world opinion against America...*(Time bell)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Mr. Raghavan, you have to conclude now. I had given you three minutes. You have already taken five minutes. Now, please conclude.

SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN: Sir, I am the most obedient Member. I will abide by your direction. The hon. External Affairs Minister has the vigour, the will and the courage to do it. This is a rare opportunity for him to mobilise the opinion of all the peace-loving nations of the world against the American attack. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY) : Shri Manoj Bhattacharya. Mr. Bhattacharya, you have five minutes' time.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. Five minutes' time is also too short. So, I will request your indulgence, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY):There are five more speakers.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, I do not know exactly from where to begin. Such an unfortunate situation is prevailing in the entire West Asia or the Middle East Asia. A spectre of uncertainty is hovering around the nations in the Middle East or the West Asia, and it is not only confined to that region, but also hovering around the world. The world is being threatened with an imminent war, the blood bath and destruction of

civilization even, and who is responsible for this? The United States of America and its cohorts, particularly, the Great Britain, they are responsible for this imminent war. The Great Britain has been subverted into a pooddle to the American foreign policy. I do not know. I don't have that command over the language to describe in short the ill designs of the U.S. imperialism. I must call a spade a spade. I do not know the art of hoodwinking my own feelings and speaking something in diplomatic manner as the External Affairs Minister may have. I do not have anything against the American people. But, Sir, I must say that this country, the United States of America, has always been atrocious; atrocious to the Third-World countries and atrocious to the people of the world, and to subserve their own unilateral feelings, they have even supported the rogue States, umpteen times.

Sir, when I was listening to the hon'ble Members, I was recalling the very audacious utterances of President Roosevelt in the yesteryears, when he said that the despot of Nicaragua, Somosa, when some journalists referred to the things done by Somosa, he is not at all a democrat, he is an autocrat, he is a dictator, President Roosevelt smiled and said, "I also admit that he is a son-of-a-bitch, but he is our son-of-a-bitch." That is America, that is, the United States. And I can quote umpteen examples where the unilateral activities, unilateral decisions and dubious decisions of American imperialism have resulted into anarchy in this world. Sir, I must say that there is no language at my command to condemn this attitude. I don't know how much this Government of India, as on date, will gather the courage to call a spade a spade and say that down with this sort of an attitude. This is threatening the world peace, this is threatening the world security, this is threatening the security and future of democracy in this world. This is against the freedom of human beings, against the human civilization as a whole. Sir, it is not that America is going to attack Iraq, it is not that America is planning only a pre-emptive attack on Iraq, it is attacking Iraq. Iraq is being attacked every now and then. Even now, Iraq is under attack, it is under siege. The most inhuman, the most gruesome siege has been imposed on Iraq. My friend, Mr. Rahman was referring to their records saying that children - one million children, 10 lakhs of children have died due to paucity of life-saving drugs. Even pencils could not be imported in Iraq, because the American Government has determined that lead can be used for some other purpose. Everyday, some 3,500 to 4000 people are dying in Iraq, because of the lack of minimum amenities, water, the essentials of human living, and this is because of America. And now, the UN

has been forced to adopt this Resolution No. 1441. Despite that Resolution, the President of Iraq, Mr. Saddam Hussein has accepted, against the wishes of the Assembly of Iraq, that they shall allow the inspectors to inspect the sites where the weapons are allegedly hidden, weapons of mass destruction. Sometimes it appears funny to me to think, who is going to inspect the weapons of mass destruction. Who is holding the maximum weapons? Whose economy is depending on the weapon industry? Whose economy is depending on the military industry? Who elected Dick Cheney, the person who is controlling the war lobby? At whose instance are they doing all these things - the interest of the American corporate houses, the interest of Exxon, Mobile, Chevron, Texaco, the oil giants - they want to grab Iraq's oil without any question, that want to install a Government that will subserve the interests of the corporate houses of America and for that purpose only the, President, Mr. Bush, Dick Cheney, the Vice-President, and the whole of America, are conspiring against Iraq. I am not holding the brief for Saddam Hussein, nor am I supporting all the activities of the Baath Party, but.....*(Time-bell)* I know that I must conclude. I know that I will not be given the chance to speak at length, even though sometimes I wish I could speak from my heart, to bring out our agony.

Sir, with all the limitations, with all my criticisms, I must say that Iraq stands in isolation amongst the oil-producing countries. Kuwait is a monarchy. Saudi Arabia is a monarchy. It is only in Iraq where there is a democratic Government, in whatever form it is. If Musharraf is a democrat, if it is a democratic Government in Pakistan, which America corroborates, then Saddam Hussein's Government would also have to be accepted as a democratic Government. They are against Saddam Hussein because they want to have a complete, unfettered access over the Iraqi oil. Iraq is the number two country, in the world, which possess the maximum quantity of oil. They are reserving the Alaskan oil for the next century, and during this century, they will be plundering the Asian oil. Shall we not stand very bravely, very boldly, and claim that the soil is ours, that we belong to the Asian countries? Sir, I would also like to draw the attention of our hon. Minister of External Affairs to the fact that even though our hon. Prime Minister, when he was in New York...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): You have to conclude now.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, I am just concluding. I seek your indulgence. I want to refer to a very important point, and I would like to seek certain clarifications from the hon. Minister of External Affairs. He must be knowing that when our hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, went to New York, in connection with the General Assembly meeting of the U.N.O., he tried to balance the situation, though not boldly. He tried to balance the situation. He did not corroborate the doctrine of Mr. Bush. Unfortunately, there are reports in different newspapers that, immediately after that, our erstwhile Foreign Minister--I have got high reverence for him, my esteemed colleague, my very, very senior colleague, Shri Jaswant Singh, who was Foreign Minister before Shri Yashwant Sinha, to my surprise, and also to the surprise to many of us, because, in India, a large number of people are against American imperialism, they are against the designs of America--when he was in New York, to attend a joint meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, expressed his vocal support to the Bush doctrine! And, he also said, "Pre-emption or prevention is inherent in deterrence!" These words are quite common with such persons. After the Pokhran explosions, we heard all these words. Sir, if, within the Indian Government, a very important member, the Finance Minister of the country, the erstwhile Foreign Minister of the country, has this confusion, and if he has expressed this sort of confusion, where do we stand? Where does the nation stand? Can we be united? Sir, I want to seek a clarification from the hon. Minister whether the Government of India, as of today, is going to reject this Bush doctrine, the doctrine of imminent danger to the world, lock, stock, and barrel.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): You have to conclude now. You have already taken nine minutes.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: I am sorry, Sir. I am just concluding.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): I have four more names.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, even though I have more to share with the House, I am concluding. I want to know from the Government of India whether they are going to reject this Bush doctrine of destruction, lock, stock, and barrel,, or whether they are going to fumble in

between. It is very, very important for us to know that because we, the people of India, have to decide not the destiny of this nation alone, but we have also to play a vital role in determining the destiny of Asia, the continent of ours. We have to also work for world peace. Billions of people in different countries, in America, in Europe, in India, are marching on the streets and shouting, "No war of destruction, no attacks on that country, no change of governance at the sweet will of some of the imperialist countries" With these words, I conclude, Sir. Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKR REDDY): Shri Rajiv Ranjan Singh 'Lalan'. Shri Rajiv Ranjan Singh 'Lalan', you have five minutes.

श्री राजीव रंजन सिंह "ललन" (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पश्चिम एशिया के कारण आज विश्व शांति के लिए खतरे की परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हो गयी है । इस का कारण अमेरिका द्वारा अपनी शक्ति का गलत प्रदर्शन और गलत इस्तेमाल है । मान्यवर, ताकतवर होना ठीक है, लेकिन जब उस ताकत का इस्तेमाल एक सीमा पार कर के किया जाता है तो ऐसी ही खतरनाक परिस्थिति पैदा होती है । मान्यवर, एक दशक पूर्व जब संयुक्त सोवियत संघ का बिखराव हुआ तो विश्व शक्ति का संतुलन बिगड़ गया जिस के कारण बाकी सारी शक्ति एक जगह सीमित हो गयी । आज अमेरिका अपनी उस सैन्य शक्ति और रक्षा बजट की शक्ति के बल पर सारे विश्व में अपना आधिपत्य कायम करना चाह रहा है। उसी आधिपत्य के क्रम में पश्चिम एशिया में उत्पन्न यह परिस्थिति है । यह उसी की एक कड़ी है । मान्यवर, जब शक्ति के बल पर अपने प्रभाव को बढ़ाने का प्रयास होता है तो उस में उचित और औचित्य, दोनों समाप्त हो जाते हैं । इस उचित और औचित्य का स्थान बर्बरता और स्वच्छंदता ले लेती है, फिर इसी के बल पर शांति व संपन्नता के लिए खतरा पैदा हो जाता है । इसलिए आज पश्चिम एशिया में जो भी परिस्थिति पैदा हुई है, वह अमेरिका की शक्ति और उस के गलत इस्तेमाल का परिणाम है । यह बात ठीक है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र प्रस्ताव के जरिए अमेरिका ने वहां विध्वंसक शस्त्रों के नियंत्रण का प्रस्ताव पास कराया और उस की शस्त्र निरीक्षक टीम भेजी गयी । अब वहां उन हथियारों का निरीक्षण हो रहा है, लेकिन यह सर्व-विदित है और स्पष्ट दिखाई देता है कि इन सारी कार्यवाहियों के पीछे अमेरिका का मकसद इराक के पेट्रोलियम भंडारों पर आधिपत्य कायम करना है । मान्यवर, इस से बहुत ही खतरनाक स्थिति पैदा होगी जोकि विश्व के लिए और विशेषकर विकासशील देशों के लिए खतरनाक होगी । आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि भारत विकासशील देशों को एकत्रित कर के उस की इस तरह की कार्यवाहियों के खिलाफ एकजुट होकर खड़ा करे और भारत इस पहल को कर सकता है । मान्यवर, निश्चित तौर पर अभी कुछ दिन पहले इराक में उत्पन्न परिस्थिति के कारण युद्ध जैसी स्थिति पैदा हुई थी और वह आज भी बरकरार है । इस स्थिति का असर भारत की अर्थ-व्यवस्था पर पड़ा, हमारे शेयर बाजार के भाव मंदी की ओर गए व पेट्रोलियम पदार्थों के दाम बढ़े । तो इस परिस्थिति और अमेरिका की कार्यवाही का पूरा असर विकासशील देशों पर निश्चित पड़ेगा, इसलिए आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि भारत को किसी भी प्रकार जितना भी संभव हो इराक पर अमेरिकी हमले को रोकने के लिए प्रयास करने चाहिए । मान्यवर, मैं एक बात और कहकर अपना भाषण समाप्त करूंगा। अभी

कुछ दिनों पहले रूस के विदेश मंत्रालय के विदेश संबंधी परिषद के एक सदस्य एलेक्सी वेस्ले का सुझाव किसी अखबार में आया था कि भारत, रूस और चीन अगर आर्थिक सहयोग के लिए सहमत हों और उन में अगर आर्थिक सहयोग विकसित हो तो दुनिया के इस शक्ति के असंतुलन को संतुलित किया जा सकता है । इसलिए मैं समझता हूं कि आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि आज विश्व में शक्ति का जो असंतुलन हुआ है और उस के परिणामस्वरूप आज इन परिस्थितियों को हम फेस कर रहे हैं, उस में भारत पहल करे व असंतुलित शक्ति को संतुलित करने का प्रयास करे । धन्यवाद ।

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY (West Bengal) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the discussion this evening is on the grave situation in West Asia, threatening world peace and security. I think the scope of the discussion should be extended to include the situation in Asia and its effects on Indian national interest because, I think, when we study or examine the situation in West Asia it should primarily be to see what effects it will have on our national interests in that region and elsewhere.

In my view, West Asia contains the following factors which have a bearing on our national interests and we should follow this with cold calculated policy decisions to the exclusion of all emotionalism on the issue. These are : firstly, Oil. Secondly, the safety, security and stability of the large Indian expatriate community in the West Asian countries and its neighbourhood. Thirdly, the war against terrorism and fourthly, the availability of technology from countries in West Asia. Coming to oil, it is very clear that the overall reason behind America's attempts or America's stated design to attack Iraq is to gain possession of its oil resources. Iraq possesses one of the largest oil resources in the world. It is not merely attacking Iraq that will serve America's purpose, it has to ensure a regime change. There is no other alternative if America is to obtain possession of the oil resources of Iraq. Should there be a regime change in Iraq, I think, Iraq will split into three entities. In the north, you will have some kind of Khurdish Autonomous Republic, in the Centre, you will have the Rump of Iraq and in the south, you will probably have some kind of Shia Republic aligned with Iran. Whatever be the outcome of such a war, it will cause tremendous instability with great adverse effects on the Indian economy because it will disturb our national interests which, centred around, ensure an uninterrupted supply of oil for our economy, as well as a great blow to the stability to the Indian community in this area which does make a large remittance of foreign exchange, so essential for our economy. As far as the war against terror is concerned, the war, which India is waging, which

emanates from Pakistan, has now extended backwards into West Asia. I do not think it is correct that Iraq, though the Americans are trying to prove, is a centre for the activities of Al-Qaeda. I do not think Iraq has any connection with Al-Qaeda but we must also note that there are definite indications that Al-Qaeda and its elements have established their presence in the regions adjoining Iraq, that is, Horn of Africa, Djibouti, Oman and Yemen. We must also note that Djibouti has now become an American base, in an area adjoining West Asia, from where they are going to carry out operations in the Horn of Africa.

Saudi Arabia, which is an Arab country near the region, has a very large Indian community. It is also well known to be the largest source of funding for the terrorist activities that are extending into India. What our relations will be with Saudi Arabia has to be carefully balanced, because in the USA, at least, there is a considerable amount of disenchantment with the role Saudi Arabia plays in the war against terrorism. So far as technology is concerned, this has a direct relationship with the Arab-Israel conflict in West Asia, in Palestine. We have been traditional supporters of the Arab cause. Arabs have been our friends. We have traditionally supported the Arab cause in all international fora. But it is also a fact that except for Iraq and some other countries, we have not experienced reciprocal support in our case when we have been threatened by Pakistan. Israel is carrying out an offensive against the people of Palestine. Israeli tanks are being opposed by Palestinian human bombs. It is a conflict with which we have to exercise some influence to bring this inhuman conflict to an end. But we must also not forget that, for us, Israel is a source of technology of various kinds most notably in the field of defence. Our interests in the Palestine conflict have to be balanced and it is up to our diplomacy to examine carefully what alternatives are there before us so that we can find a suitable via media in this conflict which we are going to face. What is the solution? What can India do? In my view, there is no solution other than to act from a position of strong self-reliance -- national interest first, national interest last, national interest every time'. We have been speaking of the Non-Aligned Movement. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Non-Aligned Movement is a thing of the past. The leaders of the Non-Aligned Movement were Yugoslavia, Egypt and Indonesia. Yugoslavia has now disappeared; Egypt is now in an extremely weak situation; Indonesia itself is on fire. Yes, we should try and rally the Non-aligned countries of the world behind us. But they will only do so if we ourselves can act from a

position of strength. If we are realists, if we are pragmatists, the situation in West Asia has to be viewed in the overall background of a dominating US presence in the world. It is a difficult choice before us because it is a warning; our economic interests are pulling us towards the USA. But whatever principles the USA is applying to West Asia, to Iraq, may in future; tomorrow or ten fifteen years hence, be applied against us. We have a difficult choice to make and India must make the best choice under the circumstances, but always in the national interest and from a position of strong self-reliance. Thank you.

श्री राजीव शुक्ल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इस सदन के भाषणो से मुझे जो कुछ सदन का मूड नज़र आ रहा है, यह अमेरिका के खिलाफ नज़र आ रहा है, लेकिन मेरा विदेश मंत्री जी से बहुत साफ अनुरोध है कि भारत को किसी की तरफ नहीं झुकना चाहिए, किसी की साइड नही लेनी चाहिए । भारत को इस विवाद मे न अमेरिका के साथ रहना चाहिए और न इराक के साथ रहना चाहिए बल्कि अपने रिश्तो मे एक बेलैंस कायम करना चाहिए । हमे इस विवाद मे नही पड़ना चाहिए, हमारे रिश्ते दोनो से बेहतर होने चाहिए । यह हो सकता है, मैं इंडो-यू0एस0 पार्लियामेंट्री फोरम का कन्वीनर हूं और साथ-साथ इराक भी जाता रहता हूं। महोदय, इराक की लीडरशिप से भी मेरी अच्छी जान-पहचान है। इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूं कि भारत के प्रधानमंत्री के भाषण के बाद यह सब कुछ शुरू हुआ और उसके बाद सरकार क्या रुख ले रही है, बाकी दलों के लोग क्या रुख ले रहे हैं, यह अपनी जगह है लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि हमें इस विवाद मे जरूरत से ज्यादा अपनी गरदन नही डालनी चाहिए । मैं खुले मत का हूं कि जो यू.एन. रिजोल्यूशन है, सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल का जो 1441 रेज़ोल्यूशन है, उसको इराक को पूरी तरह से मानना चाहिए, यू.एन. इंस्पैक्टर्स को एलाऊ करना चाहिए और ये इंस्पैक्टर्स जो भी कार्यवाही करना चाहते हैं, उनको खुली छूट देनी चाहिए । दूसरी तरफ अगर वह इसका वॉयोलेशन करता है तो सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल के विचार-विमर्श के बाद वे जो तय करें, वह कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए। इसके साथ-साथ अमरीका ने जो सैंक्शंस इराक की ऑयल मार्केटिंग पर लगाई हुई हैं, उनके तेल बेचने पर लगाई हुई हैं, ये सैंक्शंस अमरीका को हटानी चाहिए ।

महोदय, बहुत अरसे से इराक का तेल नही बिक पा रहा है । उनकी जनता के पास न दवा के पैसे हैं, न खाने के पैसे हैं और वह दिन पर दिन गरीब होती जा रही है । किसी भी मुल्क की अवाम को पीड़ा देकर आप अपनी राजनीति चलाएं, यह अच्छी बात नहीं है। इसलिए जो यू.एस. सैंक्शंस ऑयल पर हैं, वे हटनी चाहिए और इराक को जो उन्होंने "नो फ्लाई जोन" घोषित किया हुआ है, जिसे वे सख्ती से वहां लागू करते हैं, यह भी बिल्कुल गलत है । वहां फ्लाइट्स का आवागमन खुलना चाहिए, उनका जो ऑयल एक्सपोर्ट है, वह भी खुलना चाहिए और साथ-साथ इराक को भी यू.एन. इंस्पैक्टर्स को एलाऊ करके सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल के रेज़ोल्यूशन को मानना चाहिए ।

मान्यवर, मुझे लगता है कि यह दरअसल बुश साहब और सद्दाम हुसैन साहब का व्यक्तिगत मामला भी है, यह बड़ा पर्सनल मामला भी है । अगर आप इराक के अल-रशीद होटल

में जाइए तो वहां होटल में घुसते ही अमरीका के वर्तमान प्रेजीडेंट के फादर की बहुत बड़ी तस्वीर बनी हुई है और उस तस्वीर के ऊपर पांव रखकर आपको अंदर जाना पड़ता है। कोई भी व्यक्ति तब तक होटल के अंदर नहीं घुस सकता, जब तक वह उसके ऊपर पांव रखकर न चले। हमारे विदेश राज्य मंत्री जी यहां बैठे हुए हैं श्री दिग्विजय सिंह जी, इनका तो चित्र छपा था उसके ऊपर पांव रखने का, जो इंटरनेशनल एजेंसी ने रिलीज़ किया था । पहले वहां यह था कि आपको थूकना पड़ेगा, फिर आप आगे जाएंगे । अमरीका के हमारे जो प्रेजीडेंट साहब हैं, उनके दिमाग में वह खुंदक रहती है । दूसरी तरफ सद्दाम हुसैन उनको क्लाउन कहते हैं, उनको जोकर बताते हैं । इसलिए यह लड़ाई थोड़ी पर्सनल भी है, व्यक्तिगत खुंदक है जिसकी वजह से यह कान्फिलक्ट वापस इस मुकाम पर पहुंचा है ।

महोदय, मुझे लगता है कि भारत को इसमें बहुत सावधानी से रहना चाहिए । भारत को इराक के साथ बेहतर रिश्ते रखने चाहिए । रिश्ते रखने की बात तो होती है लेकिन हम कर क्या रहे हैं ? पिछले एक-डेढ़ साल से हमारे पास इराकी गवर्नमेंट की एक रिक्वैस्ट पड़ी है । सद्दाम हुसैन साहब के बेटे वहां एक जू लगा रहे हैं, उसके लिए उन्हें दो कब्स चाहिए यानी शेर के दो बच्चे चाहिए, जो हम डेढ़ साल से नहीं दे पा रहे हैं । फाईल फॉरेस्ट मिनिस्ट्री से ऐक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री, ऐक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्ट्री से ऐनवॉयरमेंट मिनिस्ट्री और ऐनवॉयरमेंट मिनिस्ट्री से फॉरेस्ट मिनिस्ट्री घूम रही है लेकिन हम शेर के दो बच्चे नहीं दे सकते? जहां तक रिश्ते कायम करने की बात है, हमें दूसरे ढंग से इराक के साथ अपने द्विपक्षीय रिश्ते मजबूत रखने चाहिए और अमरीका के साथ भी मजबूत रिश्ते रखने चाहिए ।

महोदय, यहां मैं श्री शंकर राय चौधरी जी की बात का समर्थन करूंगा कि "अल-कायदा" का कोई असर इराक में नहीं है, "अल-कायदा" को कोई प्रोटेक्शन इराक में नहीं मिल रहा है, बल्कि "अल-कायदा" की सारी गतिविधियां पाकिस्तान से हो रही हैं लेकिन अमरीका इस पक्ष को बिल्कुल इग्नोर करता है । उसे देखना चाहिए कि जो "अल-कायदा" के लोग हैं वे पाकिस्तान में ही क्यों शरण ले रहे हैं ? वे इराक में क्यों नहीं शरण लेते ? वे लीबिया में क्यों नहीं शरण लेते ? लेकिन वे वहां शरण नहीं लेते हैं । इसलिए मेरा मानना है कि सरकार को एक संतुलित रुख अख्तियार करना चाहिए और इस मामले में बैलेंस्ड तरीके से काम करना चाहिए ।

महोदय, दूसरी महत्वपूर्ण बात यू.ए.ई. के साथ हमारे रिश्तों की है । उनके मिनिस्टर ऑफ जस्टिस यहां आए थे और किस तरह से हम टैररिज्म पर काबू करें और किस तरह से हमारे बीच ऐक्स्ट्राडिशन ट्रीटी हो, किस तरह से उनके साथ सहयोग हो, इसके बारे में उनसे काफी बातें हुई थीं और तीन ऐग्रीमेंट्स पर भी दस्तखत हुए थे । मुझे लगता है कि यू.ए.ई. के साथ हमें अपने रिश्तों को बढ़ाना चाहिए । वे लगातार हमारे साथ सहयोग कर रहे हैं, सी.बी.आई. के साथ उनका सहयोग जारी है, कुछ अपराधियों को उन्होंने हमें हैंड-ओवर भी किया है और हमने भी कुछ अपराधियों को उनके पास भेजा है । यह सिलसिला जारी रहना चाहिए और सरकार को यू.ए.ई. के साथ रिश्ते मैंटेन रखने के लिए निश्चित रूप से कोशिश करनी चाहिए ।

महोदय, अंत में मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि भारत के ओपेक का सदस्य बनने की जो बात थी, उस दिशा में क्या प्रयास हुआ है ? इतना कहकर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं ।

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, in today's world, the United States of America, which is the largest democratic country in the world, should always keep in mind the rational, balanced, mood of India, which is another largest democratic country. Most importantly, India has been pursuing the non-aligned foreign policy, right from the beginning, and she wants to maintain good relations with everybody. While, on the one side, India unanimously does not accept the U.S.'s attack on Iraq which is killing innocent people including children, at the same time, we should not send a message that India is going to speak against the U.S. on their policy. We must maintain our goodwill.

Sir, I am happy that our External Affairs Minister had made a very good statement a few days back which was captioned "The West needs to get tougher with Pakistan." In that, Shri Yashwant Sinha has made a very tough statement; it is laudable. At the same time, I request the hon. Minister to stress upon the United States that it would lose its international name and fame if it continues its attack on Iraq; this has created a lot of unrest in the whole of West Asia. Another important thing is that we must also give Iraq the message that they must make all efforts to wipe out the misunderstanding with the United States that the Al Qaeda activists are camping in Iraq. There are also rumours that they have taken shelter in Pakistan. Sir, when the U.S. says that they want peace to prevail between India and Pakistan, why is it that they are not pressurising Pakistan to act against terrorism? Why is it that they are not really attacking Pakistan for spreading terrorism in India? Here, the most important thing is that India must make all efforts to convince not only the U.S. but also Russia and Britain about the terrorism sponsored by Pakistan. It is very, very sad to note that the U.S. Government has made a formal request to the United Kingdom to allow them to use the Island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean to launch an offensive against Iraq. If that is a fact, then, it is very dangerous. Therefore, India, as the biggest democratic country, has the authority and it should use its goodwill with U.K. to persuade them to tell the U.S. that it would be very dangerous not only for Iraq but also for the entire West Asia, as the effect of such an attack would spread all over Asia. It may also endanger the world peace. He must also bring this to the

notice of the United Nations. Actually, people are getting a wrong impression that the United Nations are not serious, that they are only under the control of the U.S. India must make all efforts, taking the help of Russia and the United Kingdom, to see to it that the United Nations take more effective steps to bring the U.S. and Iraq together and thus ensuring that the war do not take place.

Sir, one important point which I want to stress here is this. When the U.S. is attacking Iraq under some pretext of the Al Qaeda terrorists' presence there, why are they keeping quiet when the entire world, including Russia, have said, - we have several Statements to show this - that Pakistan is behind terrorism in India? The U.S. simply tells them, "Do not allow this; you control them and so on." They are just showing lip sympathy. We have to make the U.S. realise that India, being the biggest democratic country in the world, cannot be neglected.

Sir, we must communicate to the U.S. in clear terms that they are doing the greatest mistake and they would lose their image in the world history if they attack Iraq and merely show lip sympathy towards India.

Therefore, you must make all efforts. I will be happy, if in your reply you say what action you have taken, what you are going to do and how are you going to convince US miraculously not to commit a mistake, because India wants every country to be happy and peaceful. We do not take any side. As Shri Rajeev Shukla has said rightly, we want Iraq's happiness, US' happiness, Russian's happiness, U.K.'s happiness and everybody's happiness. And then only will India become nice. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Dr. Vijay Mallya.

DR. VIJAY MALLYA (Karnataka): America has often used its military supremacy and its relative economic supremacy to play the role of the conscience of the whole world. There is considerable debate, even in the United States and several protests have been witnessed recently on whether there should be a military strike against Iraq or not. We recently witnessed what happened in Afganistan and after bombing, perhaps every square inch of the country, they now have to acknowledge that their prime

suspect may be still alive. I think, as far as India is concerned, we are emerging as a world player in Information - Technology. We will emerge, in my view, as a very important player in bio-technology and we must look after our long-term interests, our long term relations and obviously, one of our biggest economic partners will be the United States. I know it is a very difficult path to tread. But, as has been suggested by some of my hon. Colleagues, we really have to back the winning horse. We cannot afford to alienate nations, with whom we look forward to economic cooperation and partnership. But, neither can we be seen to be supporting acts of purported terrorism. I am sure, the hon. External Affairs Minister will address these issues and take a stand, that will reflect India's position, not just in the near term but in the long-term as well.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. PRABHAKAR REDDY): Hon. Minister, Shri Yashwant Sinha.

श्री बालकवि बैरागी (मध्य प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने सिन्हा साहब को दो पंक्तियां लिखकर दी हैं। आप जवाब देते समय उनको जरूर ध्यान में रखना।

विदेश मंत्री (श्री यशवंत सिन्हा) : हां, ध्यान में रखूंगा।

श्री बालकवि बैरागी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने सिन्हा साहब को ये दो पंक्तियां लिखकर दी हैं :-

"बुश को खुश मत कीजिए आप नहीं हैं संत,
सिद्ध कीजिए आप हैं भारत के यशवंत।"

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to Shri Pranab Mukherjeeji and all the other 15 Members who have participated in this debate. We have had a very rich debate on the issue which the House took up for consideration this afternoon and as Shri Rajeev Shuklaji has said, I do not think the mood or the consensus within this House is in doubt beyond anyone's grasp. I only hasten to add that there is no disconnect or discordance between the policies followed by the Government and the mood expressed in this House, at least on this particular issue. Pranab Babu was quite right in saying - and indeed some other Members also - that India's foreign policy has always been based on national consensus. This is one issue where we keep aside our immediate political differences and every political party endeavours to look at it from the prism of national interest and in the long-term. And that has been the great

strength of India's foreign policy and I believe, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that this has come about because India's foreign policy has been rooted in the freedom struggle which this country waged.

Our leaders, at that point of time, had evolved a policy which independent India was supposed to follow. This policy was deeply influenced by the way India conducted its freedom movement, because India's freedom movement, Sir, is unique in the annals of world history and, therefore, that idealism, which informed the freedom movement of India, is an idealism which has been the hallmark of our foreign policy throughout. National interest, as General Roy Chowdhury said, has never been given a go-by. At every point of time, this country, its Government of the day, has kept national interest clearly in mind. But, as Pandit Nehru once said, the idealism of today is the realism of tomorrow, and, therefore, we have to keep in mind our long-term interest and keep in mind the idealism which has always informed our foreign policy, and also not discard, even for a moment, our very important national interests which, ultimately, our foreign policy is supposed to subserve.

Having said that, Sir, I would like to begin by a statement which the Prime Minister made in New York, when he had gone there to attend the meeting of the UN General Assembly. This was in September when, in the UN General Assembly, in the U.S. and, perhaps, in the rest of the world, the most important issue which was dominating the debate, the most important issue which was on everyone's mind, was the issue of Iraq. When he met the Press there, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, he was asked a question on India's policy on Iraq, and this is what he said: "One, India has vital and strategic interests in the Gulf, and a large India diaspora lives and works in that region. India has also had a historical relationship with Iraq". He went on to say, "At the same time, we fully understand the international community's desire to see the relevant UN Resolutions on weapons of mass destruction complied with fully. We believe that sanctions against Iraq should be lifted, in tandem with full and effective compliance by Iraq, of the UN Resolution". These were the three sutras in which the Prime Minister stated the position of India during that Press conference.

Then, the UN Security Council Resolution was adopted, and, more recently - as Members have quoted, and as Prof. R.B.S. Verma, from our side, has quoted, - on November 19, the Prime Minister, on the occasion of

Guru Nanak Jayanti, made a Statement, which was widely published in the newspapers, and set forth very clearly the point of view of this country. Subsequently, the official spokesperson of the Ministry of External Affairs replied to a question, in the course of his daily Press briefing, and said, "We recognise the validity of the unanimous decision of the United Nations Security Council, Resolution 1441, under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. We note that Iraq has accepted the terms of the Resolution, and that the UN Inspectors have commenced their work. Iraq has had to faithfully comply with the provisions of this Resolution. We have consistently stated that if Iraq complies fully with the provisions of the Security Council Resolution, sanctions against that country should be lifted. If Iraq does not comply with UN Security Council Resolution 1441, the Security Council should decide on what action should be taken. We sincerely hope in the interests of humanity, that this matter can be resolved peacefully through the United Nations". This Statement, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, was issued very recently - I think, on November 21 or 22.

In the meanwhile, there was an occasion, because as many Members have referred to non-alignment, when we were in New York for the Non-aligned Foreign Ministers' meet, on the sidelines of the UNGA took place. I also participated, on behalf of India, in that meeting. The Non-Aligned Movement adopted a Resolution on Iraq, and subsequently, at the initiative of the Non-Aligned Movement, led by its current Chairman, namely, South Africa, it was decided in the U.N. that the U.N. Security Council shall have an open debate in which all members could participate and the Permanent Representative of India participated in that debate which was held on October 17, 2002. This was before U.N. Security Council Resolution 1441 was debated. What did the Permanent Representative of India say? I think, this is the most comprehensive and authoritative exposition of India's point of view at no other forum but the Security Council of the United Nations. I am quoting some extracts from it. He said, "In contemplating use of force, the question of legitimacy and the international rule of law are important. India recognises the desire of the international community to see the full compliance by Iraq of all relevant U.N. Resolutions, including those relating to the repatriation of Kuwaiti and third country nationals and return of all Kuwaiti property. Such a desire, however, cannot justify any unilateral action on Iraq without the agreement of the U.N." He went on to say, "We are of the view that given the current configuration of circumstances, any undermining of the territorial integrity of Iraq could have unforeseen and

destructive geo-political implications. This could extend even beyond the region." Then, at another point, with regard to the discussion of U.N. Security Council Resolution which was going on, he said, "We believe that the conditions attached to any new Resolution or the modalities of their implementation should not be such as to make them unworkable or effectively to invite their rejection." Then, he talked about sanctions and he talked about how use of force should be avoided. This was the statement of the Indian representative to the U.N. Security Council of which incidentally we are not a member, at this point of time, but because NAM took the initiative, all got a chance to say what they felt, and we made this statement.

So, both in our public and in our private conversations - public statements and private conversations - what is the point of view India has always held? One, no unilateralism, but only U.N. action. Two, Iraq should comply with the U.N. Resolutions. Three, sanctions should be lifted in tandem with full and effective compliance of this, and avoidance of military conflict, avoidance of war and seeking solution through peaceful means. This has been the position of India which has been repeatedly given expression to.

Now, on the 21st and 22nd of November, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Iraq sent a Special Envoy. Their Minister for Information came to India, as the special envoy of President Saddam Hussein. He had a meeting with his counterpart, the Information and Broadcasting Minister of India; he had a meeting with me, and he had a meeting with the Prime Minister of India. In all these meetings, what did the Iraqi Special Envoy and their Minister of Information tell us? He made a very, very clear statement that Iraq had no difficulty in complying with the Resolution 1441, that Iraq shall comply with that Resolution. Two, that Iraq doesn't have weapons of mass destruction; and, therefore, Iraq didn't fear inspection; let them go wherever they want; let them inspect whatever they want; because, if Iraq doesn't have weapons of mass destruction, then, it doesn't have any reason to worry about the inspection.

Three, and very important, he expressed his fullest satisfaction with the stand taken by the Government of India. He said that he was very happy, he was very satisfied, with the stand which the Government of India

5.00 p.m.

had taken, and that there was no question of any divergence of views, as far as this was concerned, that he would go back and report the same to President Saddam Hussain.

Sir, the UN Resolution was adopted unanimously. All the fifteen Members, including the five Permanent Members and the ten Non-permanent Members, voted unanimously for this Resolution-1441. Who are the Members of the Security Council at this point of time? Of course, the U.S., the U.K., France, China and Russia. Who are the Non-permanent Members? Singapore, Mauritius, Mexico, Syria, Ireland, Norway, Colombia, Cameroon, Guyana, and Bulgaria. These are the Non-permanent Members. Syria is an Arab country. When the Syrian Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister was here, we had a detailed discussion. He was here a couple of months ago. We discussed, among other things, Iraq; we discussed, among other things, Palestine. Syria also voted for this Resolution. Since this being the unanimous Resolution of the Security Council, no Member of the Security Council differed. They spent seven weeks in negotiations. But only after the draft was negotiated, did everyone go along with that draft. Nobody differed. This is how it was carried unanimously.

Secondly, after the Security Council Resolution, President Bush was visiting Russia, recently. On November 22, after his meeting with President Putin, in St. Petersburg, a joint communique was issued. I will not quote the whole communique, but, in that, Iraq has been discussed in detail. I am quoting the operative part only. They said, "We call on Iraq, in strict compliance of the UN Security Council Resolution-1441, to cooperate fully and unconditionally in its disarmament obligation or face serious consequences." This is the joint statement of President Bush and President Putin.

The point that I am making, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, is, throughout this, India stood firm on its traditional policy towards Iraq and towards the Arab countries. One of the first group of Ambassadors, Sir, that I met, when I assumed my new responsibility, was the group of Ambassadors of Arab countries. They came and we met over a cup of tea. We discussed issues of mutual concern, bilateral concern, multi-lateral concern and global issues. I don't know whether I should say it in the House or not, but I still venture to say. We noticed that, on the question of Iraq, there was no unanimity even among the Arab Ambassadors. As General Chowdhury has said, and

as Shri Rajiv Shukla has said, let us not allow emotions to overtake our stand, overtake our response. Let our national interest, our idealism, which have always been the twin pillars of our foreign policy, guide our behaviour, our expressions, our stand, even in this case. I would, therefore, say that I do not think we have compromised on either. India - we have always maintained - has the highest stakes in that area. If I understand economics a little bit, then I would say any military conflict in that area is going to be disastrous from our point of view. We have suffered once. Dr. Manmohan Singh is sitting here. He and I - I only for a few months, he for a much longer period - faced the consequences of the 1991 conflict. We would not, therefore, like a military conflict to overtake that region once again. We would not like uncertainty to take over an already depressed world economy. We would not like to be faced with a consequence of spiralling international oil prices. We have 3.5 million Indian diaspora living in that part of the world. 35 लाख लोग वहां रहते हैं। We receive something like seven to eight billion dollars every year by way of remittances from these Indians who live in that part of the world. We buy most of our oil from that part of the world. But above all, above all, I entirely agree with the sentiments expressed in this House that Iraq under President Saddam Hussain has been a friend of India. Therefore, it is the demand of friendship also that he should not feel let down when he is under pressure. I would dare say that India has not let down Iraq. Our stand has been principled, our stand has been consistent and a stand that that satisfied the Iraqi Government. We will keep a close watch on the situation. We will continue to endeavour that military action is avoided and that whatever has to be done is done through the United Nations, it is done through peaceful means and that the world peace and security are not threatened as a result of the adventure of any particular country. Thank you.

MEESAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

(i) **The Securities and Exchange Board of India (Amendment) Bill, 2002**

(ii) **Nomination of a Member to Joint Committee on Stock Market Scam**

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha: